

Hebrews and the Temple

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M.M. Mitchell (*Chicago*)
D.P. Moessner (*Fort Worth*)

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge (*New Haven*) – C. Breytenbach (*Berlin*)
C. Gerber (*Hamburg*) – J.K. Elliott (*Leeds*)
C.R. Holladay (*Atlanta*) – D. Marguerat (*Lausanne*)
J.C. Thom (*Stellenbosch*) – P. Trebilco (*Dunedin*)
C.M. Tuckett (*Oxford*) – J. Verheyden (*Leuven*)

VOLUME 171

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/nts*

Hebrews and the Temple

*Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple
Judaism and in Hebrews*

By

Philip Church



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Church, Philip Arthur Frederick, 1948– author.

Title: Hebrews and the Temple : Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews / by Philip Church.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2017] | Series: Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; volume 171 | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016053746 (print) | LCCN 2016054489 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004339507 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004339514 (E-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Hebrews—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Judaism—History—Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.–210 A.D. | Temple of Jerusalem (Jerusalem)

Classification: LCC BS2775.52 .C58 2017 (print) | LCC BS2775.52 (ebook) | DDC 227/.8706—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016053746>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 978-90-04-33950-7 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-33951-4 (e-book)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Acknowledgements ix

Abbreviations x

1 Introduction 1

Introduction 1

The Argument of Hebrews 2

Temple Symbolism 5

Introduction to Hebrews 10

Organisation 19

Intertextuality 20

Summary 23

PART 1

Attitudes to the Temple in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism

Introduction to Part 1 27

2 Temple Affirmed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting a Positive Attitude to the Temple 29

Introduction 29

Sirach 29

The Letter of Aristeas 44

The Wisdom of Solomon 55

Sibylline Oracles 59

Philo of Alexandria 64

2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse) 70

Conclusion 77

3 Temple Rejected: Temple Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls 79

Introduction 79

Expectation of an Eschatological Temple at Qumran 81

The Community as a Temple 97

Participation in the Worship of Angels 110

Conclusion 143

- 4 Temple Contested: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting Dissatisfaction with the Temple** 144
- Introduction 144
 - 1 (Ethiopic) Enoch 145
 - Jubilees 171
 - The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 176
 - The Testament of Moses 191
 - Conclusion 197
- 5 Temple Destroyed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Responding to the Fall of the Temple** 199
- Introduction 199
 - The Fourth Book of Ezra 199
 - The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 207
 - The Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch 218
 - The Apocalypse of Abraham 225
 - Pseudo-Philo (LAB) 232
 - Sibylline Oracles Book 4 241
 - Sibylline Oracles Book 5 244
 - The Ladder of Jacob 250
 - Josephus 254
 - Conclusion 265

PART 2

Temple Symbolism in Hebrews

Introduction to Part 2 269

- 6 The Eschatological Orientation of Hebrews** 274
- Introduction 274
 - The Exaltation of the Son (Heb 1:1–14) 274
 - The Dominion of Humanity over the World to Come (Heb 2:5–18) 295
 - Conclusion 310

7 The Eschatological Goal of the People of God: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 3:1–4:11; 11:1–13:16 311

Introduction 311

The House(hold) of God (Heb 3:1–6) 311

God's Rest (3:7–4:11) 316

A City with Foundations (Heb 11:8–16) 336

You have come to Mount Zion (12:18–24) 343

A Kingdom that cannot be Shaken (12:25–29) 352

No Continuing City (13:10–16) 358

Conclusion 368

8 Jesus the High Priest of the Heavenly Temple: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 4:14–10:25 369

Introduction 369

Access to the Heavenly Temple in the Present

(4:14–16; 10:19–25) 369

A Stable and Reliable Hope (6:18–20) 388

Jesus Exalted Higher than the Heavens (7:26–28) 391

Jesus, Minister of the Sanctuary, the True Tent (8:1–13) 394

Perspectives from Hebrews 9:1–28; 10:1 411

Conclusion 431

9 Conclusion 433

Bibliography 437

Index of Subjects 514

Index of Authors 529

Index of Ancient Literature 548

Acknowledgements

This book is revised and abbreviated version of my doctoral thesis presented to the University of Otago in 2012. Many people contributed both directly and indirectly to it. Gratitude is due to my doctoral supervisors, Dr. James Harding of the University of Otago and Dr. Chris Marshall of the Victoria University of Wellington, for their wisdom, insight and encouragement. I am also grateful to Dr. Peter Walker, formerly at Wycliffe Hall at the University of Oxford and now at the Trinity School for Ministry in Ambridge, Pennsylvania, for his encouragement to pursue the project and his ongoing interest and advice.

The study would not have been completed without the help of my own institution, Laidlaw College. I am grateful for two semesters of study leave, as well as a weekly research day when I was freed from teaching and other duties to concentrate on my research. The encouragement of colleagues has also been invaluable. I am also grateful to the Longview Trust for a generous grant enabling me to travel to a conference on Hebrews and Christian Theology at St Andrews University in 2006.

Libraries are an important part of a research project such as this, and I am grateful to the librarians and staff of the following libraries for their generous assistance. I spent several weeks in a succession of visits to Tyndale House in Cambridge and numerous single days at the Dalton McCaughey Library in Melbourne, Australia. These two libraries contain wonderful resources. During my study leave in 2006 I worked in the Leon Morris Library at Ridley College in Melbourne and was welcomed as part of the Ridley College community. The librarians and staff of the Deane Memorial Library at Laidlaw College have been particularly helpful, and I cannot speak too highly of the Remote Library Service at the University of Otago. I am grateful to the librarians and staff for their efficiency and helpfulness. No request was too difficult and the service I received was always exceptional.

The love, understanding and commitment of my wife Dorothy has been a constant inspiration as she patiently endured numerous lonely evenings while I sat tapping the keys on my computer. Thanks is also due to our daughter Joanna and her husband Geoff for their hospitality on numerous visits to Melbourne, and to our grandson Liam, who anticipated many visits from his grandparents, only to see his grandfather disappear to a library. It was always a delight to meet Dorothy and Liam at the train station at the end of each day.

Abbreviations

Witnesses to the Text of the New Testament

p ¹³	P. Oxyrhynchus 657 (3rd–4th century)
p ⁴⁶	P. Chester Beatty II (c. 200 CE)
Ⲙ	Codex Sinaiticus (4th century)
A	Codex Alexandrinus (5th century)
B	Codex Vaticanus (4th century)
C	Codex Ephraimi Syri rescriptus (5th century)
D	Codex Claromontanus (6th century)
I	Codex Freerianus (5th century)
K	Codex Mosquensis (9th century)
L	Codex Angelicus (9th century)
P	Codex Porphyranus (9th century)
Ψ	Codex Athous Laurae (8th–9th century)
d	Old Latin, Claromontanus (6th century)
v	Old Latin, Parisiensis (8th–9th century)
vid	<i>ut videtur</i> (The most probable reading of a manuscript where the state of its preservation makes complete verification impossible, see NA ²⁸ , p. 59)

Other Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.). <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . 6 volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AcOr	<i>Acta Orientalia</i>
ALD	Aramaic Levi Document
ANE	Ancient Near East
APOT	Charles, R. H. (ed.). <i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books</i> . 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913
ApW	Apocalypse of Weeks
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ASV	American Standard Version
ATDan	Acta Theologica Danica
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>

BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAGD	Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (eds). <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BDAG	Danker, F. W., W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (eds). <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Third edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BHS	<i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BP	Book of the Parables of Enoch
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BRev	<i>Bible Review</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTB	<i>The Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BW	Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36)
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CCS	Continental Commentary Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CEV	Contemporary English Version
CGTSC	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges

<i>CJT</i>	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
CRAI	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CurBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
<i>CurTM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
<i>DBI</i>	Ryken, Leland, James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman III (eds.). <i>Dictionary of Biblical Imagery</i> . Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998
<i>DCH</i>	Clines, David J. A. (ed.). <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993–2011.
<i>DEJ</i>	Collins, John J., and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.). <i>The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism</i> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
<i>DLNT</i>	Martin, Ralph P. and Peter H. Davids (eds.). <i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments</i> . Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1997
<i>DNTB</i>	Evans, Craig A. and Stanley E. Porter (eds.). <i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1997
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSSSE</i>	García Martínez, F. and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.). <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98
EB	Echter Bibel
<i>EBib</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
<i>EDNT</i>	Balz, H. and G. Schneider (eds.). <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–1993
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>EDSS</i>	Schiffmann, L. H. and James C. VanderKam (eds.). <i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> . 16 volumes. Jerusalem: Keter, 1971–72
<i>ERT</i>	<i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i>
ESV	English Standard Version
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae Lovenienses</i>
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
<i>EuroJTh</i>	<i>European Journal of Theology</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
EVV	English versions of the Bible
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FBBS	Facet Books, Biblical Series
FC	The Fathers of the Church. The Catholic University of America Press: Washington DC, 1947–
<i>FF</i>	<i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i>

<i>FO</i>	<i>Folia orientalia</i>
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
GKC	Gesenius, Wilhelm, E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley (eds). <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Second English edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910
GNB	Good News Bible (Today's English Version)
HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm (eds). <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. Richardson. 5 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000
HAR	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HR	<i>History of Religions</i>
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	Buttrick, G. A. (ed.). <i>Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible</i> . 4 volumes. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1962
IDBSup	Crim, K. (ed.). <i>Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume</i> . Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JATS	<i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JDS	<i>Jewish Desert Studies</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>

<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRelS</i>	<i>Journal of Religious Studies</i>
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTC</i>	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KD</i>	<i>Kerygma und Dogma</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KJV	King James Version
LAB	Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities
LAE	Life of Adam and Eve
LCC	Library of Christian Classics
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio divina
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
<i>LQ</i>	<i>Lutheran Quarterly</i>
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NA ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> (27th edition, 1993)
NA ²⁸	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> (28th edition, 2012)

NABPR	National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion
NAC	New American Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NEB	New English Bible
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NETS	Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin Wright (eds.). <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary New Testament Series
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary Old Testament Series
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDNTT	Brown, Colin (ed.). <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . 4 volumes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1985
NIDOTTE	VanGemeren W. A. (ed.). <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . 5 volumes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997
NIGTC	New International Greek Text Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NIVAC	New International Version Application Commentary
NLT	New Living Translation
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplement Series
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
OLD	Glare, P. G. W. (ed.). <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> . Oxford University Press, 1968–1982
OT	Old Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PG	Migne, J.-P. (ed.). <i>Patrologiae Graeca</i> . 162 volumes. Paris: Migne, 1857–1886
PGL	Lampe G. W. H. (ed.). <i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1968
PHSC	Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts

PL	Migne, J.-P. (ed). <i>Patrologiae Latina</i> . 217 volumes. Paris: Migne, 1844–1864
PrTM	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
<i>PTR</i>	<i>Princeton Theological Review</i>
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Revue and Expositor</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RevScRel</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches des science religieuse</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilisations
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLTCS	Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies
<i>SBT</i>	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SBTh</i>	<i>Studia Biblica et Theologica</i>
SC	Sources chrétiennes
<i>SE</i>	<i>Studia Evangelica</i>
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia Post-biblica
<i>StudBib</i>	<i>Studia Biblica</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica
SwJT	<i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i>
TD	<i>Theology Digest</i>
TDNT	Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich (eds.). <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TDOT	Botterweck, G. J., and H. Ringgren (eds.). <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green. 15 volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
TENT	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
Them	<i>Themelios</i>
ThEv	<i>Theologia Evangelica</i>
ThSt	Theologische Studiën
TJ	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works</i> . Edited by Luci Berkowitz and Karl. A. Squitier. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990
TLOT	Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann. <i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 volumes. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997
TLNT	Spicq, Ceslas. <i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 volumes. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994
TNIV	Today's New International Version
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TRE	Krause, G. and G. Müller (eds.). <i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977–
TRENT	Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TS	Texts and Studies
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TynBul	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
USQR	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VD	<i>Verbum domini</i>
VE	<i>Vox evangelica</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series

WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZST	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>

Introduction

Introduction

The goal of the study is to examine the role and the significance of the temple symbolism found in Hebrews. The main outcome of the study is that the heavenly temple in Hebrews is to be read not as an eternal archetype of the wilderness tabernacle as is often maintained. Rather, the language is figurative. The heavenly temple is a metaphor for the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come where Christ is now enthroned.¹

This understanding emerges from my reading of the expression ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5, words that appear to describe the relationship of the wilderness tabernacle to the heavenly temple. In chapter 8 (below), I argue that this expression is to be read, not as “copy and shadow,” as though the wilderness tabernacle was a copy of a heavenly archetype, but rather as “symbolic foreshadowing.”² Moreover, the referent is not the tabernacle but the temple, and the sense of the expression is that the temple anticipates God’s eschatological dwelling with his people.³

Those who adopt the reading “copy and shadow” sometimes suggest that the tabernacle or temple are inferior to the heavenly sanctuary, often on the basis that they are material structures.⁴ This reading is tendentious. It is

1 I use the expression “eschatological dwelling” intentionally. I make no judgement whether “dwelling” refers to the “location” where God dwells in the present, and where God and his people will dwell in the eschaton, or whether it refers to the eschatological reality, long anticipated, when God would ultimately dwell with his people.

2 See Lee 1961:167–71; Hurst 1990:13–17 followed now by Barnard 2012:13–14 and Calaway 2013:105. See also BDAG 1037, s.v. ὑπόδειγμα, 2 and cf. with BADG 844, s.v. ὑπόδειγμα, 2. Hurst’s treatment lies behind the NRSV translation “sketch and shadow” (Hurst 1990:136, note 47), a translation that differs significantly from most EVV, at least since the 1901 ASV. For “copy and shadow” see RSV, NEB, NIV (1984, 2011), CEV, NLT, ESV, TNIV. KJV reads “example and shadow.” Neither *LSJ* nor BDAG give the sense “copy” for ὑπόδειγμα, nevertheless, this rendering persists, see, e.g. Thompson 2008:168; Mason 2008:35–37; Schiffman 2009:166; Hooker 2009:202; Holmes 2009:244; Kalengyo 2009:204; Svendsen 2009:157–68; Moffitt 2011:220; Richardson 2012:8–9.

3 For an earlier statement of my arguments see Church 2013b:114–28.

4 Thompson 2008:168. For an earlier statement of this view from Thompson see 1982:106. Fuller Dow 2010:172–73 suggests that the expression indicates that the Jerusalem temple was “just a shadow of the real Temple.”

unwarranted to read a cosmic dualism in Hebrews that negates the earthly, created world in favour of some heavenly “uncreated” world.⁵ Even if it could be demonstrated that the language of “copy” was appropriate, this would not necessarily indicate that the earthly copy was inferior. Hebrews nowhere expresses a value judgement as to the relative merits of either the wilderness tabernacle or the temple and the heavenly sanctuary/temple on the basis that the former are earthly realities rather than heavenly.⁶

Such cosmic dualism is usually based on perceived allusions in Hebrews to the writings of Philo, but such readings do justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews, especially in Heb 8:5. In Philo, Moses contemplated an immaterial and invisible “pattern” (παράδειγμα) upon which he based the design of the tabernacle. Hebrews does not use the word παράδειγμα, although its near synonym ὑπόδειγμα appears, referring not to the pattern that Moses saw, but to the temple. In the context the temple is a “symbolic foreshadowing” (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά) of the “heavenly things” (τὰ ἐπουράνια). The “heavenly things” are not a bicameral heavenly sanctuary,⁷ the archetype of the wilderness tabernacle, where Christ offered his blood on a heavenly altar. Rather the “heavenly things” are the new things now come, with the exaltation of Jesus to God’s right hand.

The Argument of Hebrews

Hebrews 1:1–4 is a periodic sentence setting the eschatological tone of the book. The text claims that “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, 1:2) God has spoken through a Son who sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heights, an allusion to Ps 110:1.⁸ The Son’s exaltation results in his superiority to the angels, inheriting a name superior to angelic names. This introductory sentence is followed by a catena of OT quotations establishing these claims. Hebrews 1 ends by quoting Ps 110:1, forming an inclusio around the chapter.

5 Laansma 2008a: 9–18; Adams 2009: 122–39.

6 The word *χρεῖττων* (better) appears in Heb 1:4; 6:9; 7:7, 19, 22; 8:6; 9:23; 10:34; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24. In Heb 11:16 the “heavenly country” is better than the land of Canaan in which Abraham and the patriarchs lived in tents. But this superiority is due to its being the eschatological reality that the land of promise anticipated, not due to its being heavenly rather than earthly. I discuss this in Chapter 7, below.

7 Gordon 2008: 109 uses the word “bicameral” in a discussion of Heb 8:2, wondering whether that text describes an inner sanctuary surrounded by an outer tent, or whether the heavenly temple is “unicameral,” with the sanctuary and tent co-extensive.

8 The LXX reference is Ps 109:1. I use English versification unless otherwise noted.

In Hebrews 2, the author draws two implications from the claim of the Son's superiority to angels. First, since God's word through angels was accompanied with appropriate sanctions, the readers must pay closer attention to God's word through the Son. Second, the Son is exalted above the angels as a human,⁹ who has been "crowned with glory and honour." His exaltation was not for his sake alone. Rather, God has made the world to come subject not to angels but to humans,¹⁰ and while that may not be apparent in the present, it is apparent that Jesus has been crowned with glory and honour, as the "pioneer" (ἀρχηγός, 2:10) through whom God is "bringing many heirs to glory" (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, 2:10).¹¹ The glory of humanity as God's vicegerents ruling over the creation has its eschatological outcome in their ruling over the world to come where Jesus is now enthroned.

Hebrews 3–4 enlarge upon the theme of the world to come in terms of the rest that awaits the people of God. This is the rest that God entered at the creation (Heb 4:4, citing Gen 2:1–3). This description of the eschatological goal of the people of God in terms of rest implies an understanding of the created cosmos as a temple. The rest awaiting the people of God is in the eschatological temple of the new creation, where Jesus is now enthroned, and where God will dwell with his people.

There are hints early in Hebrews that Jesus is to be understood as a priest. In 1:3 his exaltation to the right hand of God was after "making purification for sins" (καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος), and in 2:17–3:1 Jesus is called both a high priest and a priest. That he is to be understood as a priest is announced for a third time in 4:14–16, which leads into the establishment of this claim from Ps 110:4 (Heb 5:1–10). After an exhortation encouraging the recipients to remain faithful (5:11–6:20), the text returns to the theme of the high priesthood of Jesus. The author draws out the implications of this claim in Heb 7, with a concluding summary in 7:26–28 forming an inclusio with 5:1–3.

9 I argue in chapter 6 (below) that the expression βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον ("a little lower than the angels") describes Jesus as we see him now—a member of the class of those described in Ps 8:6 (LXX) as "a little lower than the angels," i.e. "a human."

10 I defend this debated reading of Heb 2:5–10 in Chapter 6, below.

11 I translate υἱός ("son") with "heir," since English has no non-gender specific word to express the honorific implications of "son" in this context. These are the sons and daughters of God, the siblings of Jesus, referred to as πόλλοι υἱοί ("many sons," v. 10); ἀδελφοί ("brothers," vv. 11–12); and παιδία ("children," v. 13)—all terms that can be used for both men and women in NT Greek. The NRSV "children" in v. 10 is inappropriate as it obscures the solidarity between the "Son" of Heb 1 and the "sons" of Heb 2:5–18 (Gäbel 2006: 153–54). The idea of "son" as "heir" appears in Heb 1:1, 4 (Hooker 2009: 199, note 21).

While Ps 110:1 is cited more often in the NT than any other OT text,¹² Ps 110:4 appears only in Hebrews.¹³ It seems that the author understood that if Ps 110:1 applied to the exalted Christ, so too did Ps 110:4. As Son of God and priest like Melchizedek, he can be understood in terms of both the royal and cultic aspects of Ps 110. Hebrews 7 establishes that the high priest Jesus is superior to the descendants of Aaron, and Heb 9:1–10:18 establishes that his sacrifice is superior to theirs. The effectiveness of this sacrifice is evident in that its outcome is “perfection” (τελείωσις), something the former priesthood and sacrificial system could not provide (7:11–19). This enables the followers of Jesus to approach God (7:19).

The “main point” (κεφάλαιον) of the argument appears between the claims about the superior priesthood and the superior sacrifice of Jesus; that is, that Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of God and serves as a minister of the sanctuary (Heb 8:1). Hebrews 8 introduces the subject of the heavenly sanctuary and the “ministry” (λειτουργία) of Jesus, high priest of that sanctuary. The heavenly sanctuary is the true tent pitched by the Lord, and not by a human, of which the Jerusalem temple is a symbolic foreshadowing (Heb 8:5), prefiguring the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

Hebrews 10:19–25 is a transitional pericope corresponding to 4:14–16, and just as Heb 4:14–16 is followed by a warning against falling away (5:11–6:20), so also 10:19–25 is followed by a similar warning (10:26–39). Hebrews 11 is a list of faithful people from the past who persevered and did not fall away, culminating with the example of Jesus, who endured the cross without shrinking from the shame it entailed and is now exalted to the right hand of the throne of God (12:1–3). Hebrews 12:4–17 is an exhortation to endure suffering, recognizing it as the Lord’s discipline.

The rhetorical climax of Hebrews is in 12:18–29 which returns to the theme of the heavenly temple and the world to come. Here, the recipients are viewed as having come to the heavenly (eschatological) temple, as participating in the worship of angels and as anticipating the shaking of the creation. God will shake the creation to remove what is incompatible with the world to come and enable the unshakeable kingdom to remain. Hebrews 13 concludes the book with a set of ethical instructions and an exhortation to follow Jesus outside the camp (Jerusalem), seeking the city to come (the new Jerusalem).

12 NA²⁸ lists Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 20:42; 22:69; Acts 2:34; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12. Heb 12:2 is a significant omission from this list, as is Col 3:1 (which NA²⁷ includes).

13 Hebrews 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:3, 11, 15, 17, 21. NA²⁸ also identifies an allusion in Rom 11:29, probably associating the adjective ἀμεταμέλητος in Rom 11:29 with the verb μεταμέλομαι in Ps 110:4.

The superiority of Christ and his sacrifice is the main theme of Hebrews. It serves a sub-theme concerning the people of God. Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God in the world to come (Heb 1:6; 2:5) is as the "pioneer" (ἀρχηγός, 2:10; 12:2) or "forerunner" (πρόδρομος, 6:19–20) of his followers who are on a pilgrimage to where he is. The readers are to persevere to their eschatological goal, described as the world to come, God's rest, the city to come, the true tent pitched by the Lord, Mount Zion and the heavenly Jerusalem. All these expressions are coterminous and refer to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. The text explains how Jesus has reached this exalted position and made it possible for the people of God to share his glory. If they do not persevere to reach this goal, they risk the loss of everything.

Temple Symbolism

I use the term "temple symbolism" to refer to the complex set of ideas evoked by the language of "temple" as well as the literal structures to which the word "temple" refers.¹⁴ Israel's sanctuaries symbolised the dwelling of God with his people.¹⁵ This is clear in Exod 25:8 where YHWH instructs Moses to build a "sanctuary" (מִקְדָּשׁ, LXX ἁγίασμα) so that "I can dwell among you" (וְשָׁכַנְתִּי בְתוֹכְכֶם),¹⁶ and 2 Chr 6:2 where Solomon declares that the exalted house he has built for YHWH is a place for him to reside forever (מִבְּנוֹ לְשִׁבְתָּךְ עוֹלָמִים, LXX κατασκηνώσαι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας).¹⁷ While these texts recognise that

14 See the discussion and definitions in Macky 1990: 49–56 and in *DBI* xiii–xiv, where the editors claim that "image" is a foundational term naming any object or action, that "symbol" is "an image that stands for something in addition to its literal meaning," and that "metaphor" functions much like "symbol." I use the terms "symbol/symbolism" and "metaphor" more or less interchangeably, depending on the context.

15 Haran 1985: 13–15; *DBI* 849. Macky 1990: 95–99 discusses the symbolism of Heb 8:5 in terms of "metaphors for metaphor" (p. 95). He finds the contrasts "Copy-Original" and "Shadow-Body" to be relatively important in picturing the way that "we see through a symbol to a mysterious subject that we cannot know directly." I will argue in chapter 8 (below) that this particular set of contrasts is absent from Heb 8:5; nevertheless, Macky's analysis still stands when Heb 8:5 is read as a claim that the temple is a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things. God's dwelling with his people in the tabernacle and the temple prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

16 The LXX reads καὶ ὀφθῆσμαι ἐν ὑμῖν ("and I will appear among you").

17 The same Hebrew words appear in the parallel text 1 Kings 8:13, but are absent from the LXX, although 3 Kgdms 8:53a refers to the temple as an appropriate house for God himself to dwell in anew (οἶκον ἐκπρεπῆ σαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος).

God dwells in the temple, they do so in tension with the understanding that God dwells in heaven. God's heavenly dwelling reflects the same tension, since Solomon claims in his dedication prayer that the highest heaven cannot contain God, much less the house that he (Solomon) has built (1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chr 6:18).¹⁸ Thus language of both earthly and heavenly temple symbolises the dwelling place of God. Language such as this in my mind when I refer to "temple symbolism."

Two models have generally been proposed for the relationship of the earthly to the heavenly temple. Some scholars argue that earthly sanctuaries are copies of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary,¹⁹ and some of these consider that this archetypal heavenly sanctuary "is an entity located in heaven."²⁰ In spite of attempts to establish this, it is doubtful whether it can be upheld for the OT, although it is clearer in some of the texts from Second Temple Judaism that I discuss in Chapter 4 (below).²¹ The alternative model works on the assumption that an earthly sanctuary is a microcosm of the universe, also understood as a sanctuary/temple. In this case the temple is a link between heaven and earth, and in some sense heaven on earth,²² so much so, that to be in the temple is to be "in heaven." Thus, Otzen can claim,

The temple is at once an *imago mundi*, 'image of the world', reflecting the cosmos, and is *imago coeli*, 'image of heaven', reflecting the heavenly

18 In his prayer Solomon repeatedly asks God to hear from his dwelling place in heaven (1 Kings 8:30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49; 2 Chr 6:21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, 35, 39).

19 For this model see e.g. Patai 1967: 54–139 (esp. 105–17); Levenson 1984: 283–98; 1985: 111–84 (esp. 137–45); Hurst 1990: 21–22; Bruce 1990: 184; Hayward 1996: 8–10 and *passim*; Koester 1989: 59–63; Barker 1991: 57–70; Fletcher-Louis 1997a: 156–62; 2002: 61–68; Beale 2004b: 29–80; Walton 2006: 123–28. The model is usually traced back to Gudea of Lagash (c. 3000 BCE), and the Code of Hammurabi (Hurst 1990: 21–22 is a convenient summary). See also Philo *Mos.* 2.74; *Somn.* 1.206; *Leg.* 3.96; Josephus. *Ant.* 3.123; *J.W.* 5.212, 2 Bar. 4:2–7; Asc. Is. 7.10.

20 De Souza 2005: 18.

21 Alexander 2006: 54 suggests that while the roots of this idea are present in texts such as Exod 25:40, "the idea that there is a celestial temple corresponding to the earthly temple only clearly emerges in Judaism in the later postexilic period." Newsom 1985: 60 considers that "the only clear example of the description of heaven as a temple in a pre-exilic source is Isaiah 6." She further suggests that it is "only with the literature of the Hellenistic period that one finds clear evidence of speculation on a heavenly temple" (*ibid.*).

22 Eliade 1959: 26–27, 36–42; Lundquist 1983: 205–19; Levenson 1985: 137–45; Parry 1994: 133–37; Walton 1995: 155–75; Kline 1996; Vermeylen 2007: 14–16; Lioy 2010: 1.

world. The temple is where heaven and earth meet; indeed, the temple *is* heaven on earth.²³

There is a significant difference between these two models. Those who consider that earthly sanctuaries are copies of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary concentrate on a spatial and vertical correspondence between the two. For example, de Souza concludes that in the Hebrew Bible, the heavenly sanctuary was “understood as existing in structural and vertical correspondence to the earthly counterpart,” and that it is “a place in heaven and . . . should not be interpreted as . . . a reality coextensive with heaven.”²⁴ Those who consider the earthly sanctuary to be a microcosm of the universe argue for a temporal and horizontal correspondence. Since a sanctuary is understood as where God is encountered, the whole creation may be understood as a sanctuary. God rested in this cosmos/sanctuary on the seventh day (Gen 2:2), and his rest anticipates the new creation where God and his people will find their ultimate rest. In this model, Eden rather than the heavenly sanctuary is the archetypal temple, and Israel’s tabernacle and temples anticipate the dwelling of God with his people in the eschaton.²⁵

This symbolism reaches its climax in Rev 21:1–22:5 where the new heaven and earth are pictured as an “arboreal city-temple.”²⁶ Here, a loud voice announces that “the tent of God” (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) is with people and “he will live in a tent with them” (καὶ σκηνώσει μετ’ αὐτῶν). This city-temple is the new Jerusalem, appearing as a cube perhaps the size of the then known world (Rev 21:16), an allusion to the holy of holies in the tabernacle and temple, with sufficient space for all people. The nations will stream to this city (21:24) from which all uncleanness is excluded (21:27). The river of the water of life flows from the throne of God, and the tree of life is there, further echoes of the primeval Eden temple. Thus, the new heaven and earth in their entirety are pictured as a temple.

While the source of much heavenly temple symbolism seems to be Ezekiel’s visionary temple (Ezek 40–48),²⁷ Exod 15:17 is another important text.²⁸

23 Otzen 1984: 207.

24 De Souza 2005: 496–97.

25 Beale 2004a: 197–200; 2004b: 25–26.

26 Beale 2004b: 23.

27 See Ezek 37:27; 40:2–3; 43:4; 47:1, 12; 48:30–34. See Koester 1989: 122–23, esp. the chart on p. 122.

28 Exodus 15:17 is absent from the list of allusions and citations in NA²⁸ (p. 839). It may be echoed in Eph 2:22, where the word referring to God’s dwelling place in Exod 15:17

Here “Moses” addresses God: you brought your people in and planted them on “the mountain of your inheritance” (הר נחלתך, LXX ὄρος κληρονομίας σου), “the place prepared for your dwelling” (מכון לשבתך, LXX ἐτοῖμος κατοικητήριον σου) and “the sanctuary your hands established” (ידך כוננו...מקדש, LXX ἁγίασμα...ὃ ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου).

These three expressions have the same referent,²⁹ variously identified as Sinai³⁰ the cosmic mountain,³¹ the sanctuary at Gilgal,³² the land of Canaan as a whole,³³ Zion,³⁴ the Jerusalem temple,³⁵ and God’s “eternal enthronement.”³⁶ Any one of these options on its own is insufficient. Indeed, “the author

(κατοικητήριον) describes the people of God as a dwelling place for God (κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ), that is a temple (see Beale 2004b: 257). This word only appears elsewhere in the NT in Rev 18:2 as a dwelling place of demons. In the LXX it refers to God’s dwelling place in Exod 15:17; 1 Kings 8:39, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6:30, 33, 39; 3 Macc 2:15; Ps 32:14 (EVV 33:14); 75:3 (EVV 76:2); Ode 1:17 (citing Exod 15:17). In Exod 15:17 the ultimate goal of the Exodus is the sanctuary (ἁγίασμα) God’s hands have prepared (ἐτοίμαζω). This verb appears in Heb 11:16, for the eschatological city God had prepared for Abraham and his descendants, and in Rev 21:2 where the holy city also appears as a bride prepared (ἐτοίμαζω) for her husband. Gäbel 2006: 469–70 identifies an allusion to Exod 15:17 in Heb 11:16, and I argued for this, somewhat tentatively, in Church 2013a: 354–55. Both Dimant 1984: 519 and Schwemer 1995: 289 refer to Exod 15:17 as “the *locus classicus* for the expectation of the eschatological sanctuary in early Judaism.”

- 29 Watts 1957: 377; Propp 1998: 568–69; Russell 2007: 24, 158 (note 30), and p. 80. See also the analysis of the structure of Exod 15:12–17 in De Souza 2005: 132, who relies in part on Howell 1989: 38.
- 30 Freedman 1975: 6–7; 1977: 46–48; 1981: 21–30, who describes it as “the only true temple of God—made not by human but by divine hands... located on the top of the mountain sacred to the god” (p. 21); and Russell 2007: 80–96.
- 31 Clifford 1972: 138–39, who describes הר נחלתך as “the hill country of Canaan,” and the מקדש as “the earthly representation of the temple-palace of the God.” Durham 1987: 209 extends the referent to ultimately include Mount Zion.
- 32 Cross 1973: 142.
- 33 Watts 1957: 388; Fretheim 1991: 162.
- 34 Clements 1965: 52–55; Stuart 2006: 361.
- 35 Brenner 1991: 136–42; Fuller Dow 2010: 47–48.
- 36 Görg 1990: 422; Propp 1998: 542–43; Beale 2004b: 63, 147, 235. Propp 1998: 569–70 locates the enthronement in “Canaan or the northern highlands” or Zion, and more precisely, the Jerusalem Temple. Howell 1989: 40 distinguishes between הר נחלתך, which she identifies with Canaan, and the other two expressions, which she identifies with Zion and/or the Temple. Davies 1998: 17 suggests that the sanctuary of Exod 15:17, is not a “physical structure on a particular mountain... [but a] sanctuary... coextensive with the whole of the promised land, pictured in terms of the cosmic mountain motif.”

[of the Song] anticipated a fulfilment on a larger cosmic level, a *Steigerung*.³⁷ Ultimately, it refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. Those who read the text in this way in the ancient world anticipated that in the eschaton God would dwell with his people in an eschatological sanctuary, prepared by God and not by human hands.³⁸

The relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries in Hebrews has been read as both vertical/spatial and horizontal/temporal, and several scholars suggest that a key to understanding the book lies in understanding the relationship between these axes.³⁹ Attridge suggests that neither axis can be subordinated to the other,⁴⁰ listing several scholars who have done that.⁴¹ I will argue that the temporal and horizontal correspondence predominates, although I do not eliminate the vertical and spatial correspondence. The heavenly temple imagery in Hebrews primarily refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, although it is clear that Christ has been exalted to the right hand of God in the heights (ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, 1:3) in the present, and has entered

37 De Souza 2005: 149. For a similar idea see Lohfink 1969: 80–86; Ninow 2001: 130–36; Beale 2004b: 110, 147, 235. Ninow notes that in 1 Kings 8:39, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6:30, 33, 39; Ps 33:14; Dan 8:11, מִכּוֹן refers to God's heavenly dwelling place. He concludes, "... the author of the song [Exod 15:1–18] anticipated as well a fulfilment that is on a larger, cosmic level." Apart from these texts and Exod 15:17, מִכּוֹן appears in Ezra 2:68 (the Jerusalem temple); Isa 4:5 (Zion); Ps 89:14 (מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם 15); 97:2 (the place of God's throne); 1 Kings 8:13; 2 Chr 6:2 (יְהוָה's earthly dwelling place); and Ps 104:5 (the foundations of the earth). See also 2 Macc 1:29; 2:17–18. Propp 1998: 567–68 notes that while Exod 15 is now in a literary context, it was originally liturgical, and suggests that "[w]herever it is sung, there is Yahweh's mountain." He proposes that in its context in Exodus the referent is primarily Sinai; in the Hexateuch, Canaan; in the entire Hebrew Bible, Sinai, Canaan or Zion; and in early Jewish literature and the NT, the kingdom of heaven. In this context he also refers to "a celestial equivalent to Jerusalem and/or the Temple," citing (among other texts) Heb 12:22–24. Rabbinic exegesis read Exod 15:17 in the same way. Mek. de Rabbi Ishmael, Tractate Shirata 10 indicates that the temple to be built with יְהוָה's hands would be the eschatological temple. See also Midr. Ps 90. Tzoref 2009: 203 (note 30) also lists some later rabbinic texts.

38 11QTemple XXIX 8–10; 4QmidrEschat^a III 3; Jub. 1:17, 26–29.

39 Barrett 1954: 363–93; Williamson 1970: 144–46, 576–78; Hurst 1990: 9–11; Sterling 2001: 192; Mackie 2007: 3–8.

40 Attridge 1989: 224.

41 Scholars who subordinate the spatial to the temporal include Cullmann 1962: 54–55; Traub 1967: 541; Nomoto 1968: 10–25; Williamson 1970: 142–59; Hofius 1972: 72; Hughes 1979a: 45; Peterson 1982: 131; Mackie 2007: 161. Those who subordinate the temporal to the spatial include Thompson 1982: 1–7; Käsemann 1984: 222–27; Johnson 2006: 201–2.

“the most holy place” (τὰ ἅγια, that is the heavenly temple, 9:12).⁴² A number of spatial and temporal images converge. The heavenly and eschatological temple where Christ is exalted and where God will dwell with his people in the eschaton is a dwelling not made with hands (Heb 9:11, 24), the sanctuary of which Christ is the minister, the true tent pitched by the Lord and not a human (Heb 8:1–2), and the eschatological goal of the people of God (13:14) that they also have access to in the present (12:22–24).

Introduction to Hebrews

The anonymous early Christian document known as ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ may be the most enigmatic in the NT,⁴³ and while questions concerning the identity of the author, the place of writing, the location and identity of the recipients, and the occasion are all shrouded in mystery, a few comments are necessary at this point, since they have a bearing on what follows in Part 2.

Genre

Hebrews is traditionally referred to as an Epistle, but lacks the standard features of this genre, including the customary opening greeting found, for example, in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline letters, although there is a brief epistolary conclusion.⁴⁴ Moreover, some of the rhetorical features of Hebrews indicate that it could be understood as an oral discourse,⁴⁵ and the frequent appeal to the LXX, with a considerable number of quotations, allusions and echoes, have led many scholars to conclude that it is a written homily, especially when the author's description of his work as a λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (“word of exhortation,” Heb 13:22) is considered.⁴⁶ Mosser has mounted a strong critique of such

42 See also 4:14; 6:19–20; 7:26. This symbolism is similar to that in Revelation, where in such texts as 11:19; 15:5–8 there is a temple in heaven where God dwells, while in the final eschatological vision the heavenly city lacks a temple (21:22), symbolising direct access to God and the lamb for the people of God.

43 The superscription ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ first appears in P⁴⁶ (circa 200 CE). Nevertheless, it is of very little help in ascertaining anything about the recipients of Hebrews, other than that the scribe responsible for P⁴⁶ understood that the addressees may have been “Hebrew” Christians.

44 The authenticity of Heb 13 has not gone unchallenged. I discuss this in chapter 7 (below).

45 Swetnam 1969: 261–69; Lane 1991a: lxxv–lxxx; Ellingworth 1993: 59–62; DeSilva 2000b: 35–58; Koester 2001: 79–96; Thompson 2008: 10–13.

46 In Acts 13:15, Paul and Barnabas are invited to give a λόγος παρακλήσεως in the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch. Scholars who argue that Hebrews is a synagogue sermon include

proposals and finds limited evidence for the genre “sermon” in the first century.⁴⁷ It is probably best, then, to adopt the traditional description of Hebrews as an epistle, with the rhetorical features indicating that it was intended to be read aloud to a Christian congregation,⁴⁸ rather than (anachronistically) referring to it as a “sermon” to be preached to such a congregation.

Structure

While there is little consensus on the structure of Hebrews,⁴⁹ certain compositional features stand out. One significant feature is the alternation of genre between exposition of the OT and exhortation based on that exposition.⁵⁰ Other rhetorical features include the use of *inclusio* to delineate different sections, anticipatory announcements of the subject of following sections, and hook-words to tie different sections together.⁵¹ The presence of an *inclusio* in 4:14–16 and 10:19–25 identifies the opening and closing of a long central section

Thyen 1955: 16–18; Swetnam 1969: 261–69; Wills 1984: 280–83; Lane 1985: 13–18; Attridge 1989: 13–14; 1990: 226–27; Bruce 1990: 389; Lane 1991a: lxix–lxxv; Weiss 1991: 40; DeSilva 2000b: 57; Koester 2001: 80–81; Schenck 2003: 23; Walker 2004: 231–49; Gelardini 2005: 107–27; 2007: 63; Johnson 2006: 9–11; Mitchell 2007: 15–16; Mackie 2007: 24–25; O’Brien 2010: 20–22. See the cautionary remarks in Ellingworth 1993: 63. Gelardini 2005: 107–27 attempts to define the precise occasion in the liturgical calendar for its delivery, arguing that it is a sermon for *Tisha b’av*, recalling the destruction of the first and second temples. See the critique of Gelardini’s proposals in Mosser 2009b.

47 Mosser 2013: 523–51.

48 Ellingworth 1993: 62.

49 Joslin 2007: 122. Joslin reaches this conclusion after summarising eight different approaches to the structure of Hebrews, those of Guthrie 1983: 58–59; Vaganay 1940: 269–77; Spicq 1952: 1:27–38; Nauck 1960: 199–206; Vanhoye 1976; Bruce 1985: 6–12; Attridge 1989: 13–21; Guthrie 1994. Joslin 2008: 91–131 presents a slightly more technical survey of the same eight approaches to the structure. For other discussions of the structure see Swetnam 1972: 368–85; 1974: 333–48; Lindars 1989: 382–406; Stanley 1994: 245–71; Westfall 2005; Lincoln 2006: 23–33.

50 See the chart in Guthrie 1994: 144. Whereas the Pauline Epistles usually contain theology followed by exhortation (e.g. Rom 1–11; 12–16), in Hebrews exhortations to the readers arise at key points as the work progresses. Guthrie 1983: 58–59 artificially separates these two genres and attempts to relegate the exhortations to Heb 10:19–13:25, but this takes no account of clear paraenetic material in (e.g.) 2:1–4 (which Guthrie does call an exhortation); 4:14–16; 5:11–6:20. For an early critique of the view that 1:1–10:18 contains theology and 10:19–13:25 exhortation see Vaganay 1940: 269.

51 The presence of *inclusios* and hook-words was first identified by Vaganay 1940: 269–77, and the first book-length treatment of the structure of Hebrews using these and other rhetorical features was Vanhoye 1963 (second edition 1976, and summarised English edition 1989).

(5:1–10:18) dealing with the priesthood of Christ and his sacrifice,⁵² which has enabled access to the presence of God for his followers.⁵³ This *inclusio* indicates, at a macro level at least, a tri-partite structure for Hebrews, with major section breaks after 4:16 and 10:25.⁵⁴ I will sub-divide my exegetical work on Hebrews on this basis.

Authorship

While Christians in the east believed Paul to be the author of Hebrews as early as the second century, and while Pauline authorship was assumed in the pre-critical period, this is almost universally denied today.⁵⁵ Most claim that the author is unidentifiable, being content to agree with Origen that only God knows who wrote it.⁵⁶ However, while the identity of the author is unknown, some things can be deduced from the text. He was apparently male, as the masculine participle referring to himself in 11:32 indicates (ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος, “time would fail me to relate . . .”). Furthermore, the assumed readers knew his identity, since in 13:18, he asks for prayer for a clear conscience and that he would be restored to them soon.⁵⁷

52 See the chart in Guthrie 1994: 79–80. This *inclusio* setting off the long central section was first identified by Nauck 1960: 199–206.

53 Guthrie 1994: 119–20.

54 This tri-partite scheme is also adopted by Westfall 2005: 188, who also splits the central section into two parts at 8:1. See her discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this structure on pp. 14–16.

55 For a recent defence of Pauline authorship see Black 1999a: 32–51; 1999b: 78–86. Other recent discussions of authorship are found in Eisenbaum 2005: 217–24; Georgi 2005: 239–44; Miller 2005: 245–64; Koosed and Seesengood 2005: 272–77; Rothschild 2009.

56 Eusebius records the words from Origen in *Hist. eccl.* 6.25: Τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν. Origen's earlier comment is usually omitted, Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποίμ' ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντος τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὥσπερ εἰ σχολιογράφησαντος τὰ εἰρημένα τοῦ διδασκάλου, “If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of someone who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher.” (ET Schaff and Wace 1952: 355).

57 The change from the plural to the singular in 13:18–19 may suggest that more than one person was involved in the writing, since the author asks the readers to “pray for us” (Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν), “that I may be restored to you soon” (ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν). This dual (or multiple) authorship may be behind the suggestion of Clement of Alexandria recorded in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.14 (ET *ibid.*: 345) that Paul “wrote Hebrews in Hebrew and that Luke translated it for the Greeks” (καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολήν, Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα, ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν). On this basis, Black 1999a: 32–51; 1999b: 78–86 posits Paul as the primary author and Luke as

I decline to speculate on the identity of the author. I note, however, that the literary skill and seminal thinking evident in the text, and the fact that it was accepted into the Christian canon, albeit rather late,⁵⁸ would seem to indicate that it was written by some apostolic figure. The reference to Timothy in 13:23 suggests that the author may have been part of the Pauline circle.⁵⁹

Location of Author and Recipients

Hebrews 13:19, 23 imply that Hebrews was written and sent to a congregation in another location, which the author hoped to visit in the near future. The reference to Italy in 13:24 seems to indicate some connection with Rome, and the external evidence, where Hebrews follows Romans in leaf 21 (*recto*) of P⁴⁶,⁶⁰ and the allusions to Heb 1:1–4 in 1 Clem. 36, tend to support this. However, the reference to Italy is ambiguous. It could either imply that the author was sending his Epistle from Italy, along with greetings to a congregation elsewhere; or that he was sending his Epistle to Italy, from some other location, where some from Italy were also located. This ambiguity cannot be resolved,⁶¹ although the external evidence is slightly in favour of locating the destination in Rome. Other locations for the author or the recipients other than Rome have been suggested, most of which should be discounted,⁶² although the veiled references to Jerusalem in 13:12–14 may indicate some connection with

the amanuensis. He also proposes (following Clement) that it was written to Rome, and that Paul's identity was concealed since he was *persona non grata* in Rome and a letter from him would not be accepted. The author refers to himself over against his readers in the first person plural in 2:5; 5:11; 6:9, 11; 13:18, and in the first person singular in 11:32; 13:19, 22, 23. It seems impossible to determine whether the plurals in 2:5; 5:11; 6:9, 11; 13:18 are literary plurals (Attridge 1989: 402; Bruce 1990: 386; Johnson 2006: 353; O'Brien 2010: 530–31), whether they indicate joint authorship, whether they refer to the author and those with him (Ellingworth 1993: 724–25; Koester 2001: 572), or whether he is identifying with the leaders he refers to in 13:17 (Lane 1991b: 556). There are also switches between what appear to be literary plurals and singulars in Col 4:3 and 1 Thess 5:25–26.

58 See the discussion in Koester 2001: 19–27.

59 Ibid.: 42–45; Rothschild 2009: 46–47. Rothschild concludes that “Paul lurks behind Hebrews,” even if the identity of the author is unknown (p. 217).

60 See the photograph in Comfort and Barrett 2001: 224. For an electronic image of this leaf of P⁴⁶ see online: http://www.lib.umich.edu/papyri-king-james/05_02.jpg. Accessed 2 August 2016.

61 Attridge 1989: 410–11; Lane 1991b: 571.

62 See the discussion of these other locations in Salevao 2002: 118, and the recent discussion in O'Brien 2010: 14–15, who tentatively favours Rome.

Jerusalem.⁶³ While certainty is not possible, an origin or destination in either Rome or Jerusalem seems most likely.⁶⁴

Date

Recent scholarship is divided on whether Hebrews is to be dated prior to or after the fall of Jerusalem.⁶⁵ Those who prefer the earlier date point to such texts as Heb 10:1–4, 11–12, which refer to temple sacrifices in the present tense, asking whether, if they could provide perfection for the worshippers, they would not have ceased being offered.⁶⁶ Others argue that the present tense verbs in this sentence have no bearing on the date of Hebrews,⁶⁷ since there are other texts that refer to temple sacrifices in the present tense after it had been destroyed.⁶⁸ But I do note that these writers were not discussing the end of the former cultus as was the author of Hebrews, and had the temple been destroyed when he wrote, he could have driven the point home by pointing to that event.⁶⁹

Hebrews 10:1–4 is a single sentence concluding with the declaration that animal sacrifices cannot remove sins. Verse 2 claims that the same sacrifices, continually offered year after year would have ceased being offered if they could make the worshippers perfect, and since they have not ceased, the people are still conscious of sin. I have deliberately paraphrased the sentence in this

63 I discuss this in Chapter 7, below.

64 Lane 1991a: lviii–lxvi argues for a Roman destination, while more recently Ben Ezra 2003: 191–92 and Mosser 2009a: 397–404 argue for a Jerusalem destination. Buchanan 1972: 255–63 argued that Hebrews was written from Jerusalem to a monastic community of pilgrims who had “come to Mount Zion” (12:22), which he reads as a reference to the earthly Jerusalem. This is quite unlikely.

65 Those who adopt a date prior to 70 CE include Lindars 1989: 402–3; Bruce 1990: 20–22; Lane 1991a: lxii–lxvi; Ellingworth 1993: 29–33; Walker 1994: 56–66; Guthrie 1998: 22–23; DeSilva 2000b: 20–23; Hagner 2002: 25; Johnson 2006: 38–40; Mosser 2009a: 404. Those who adopt a later date include Isaacs 1992: 41–45; Eisenbaum 2005: 224–31; Aitken 2005: 133–36; Georgi 2005: 243; Mitchell 2007: 7–11. Those who argue that precision is not possible include Attridge 1989: 6–9 (somewhere in the period 60–100 CE); Koester 1994: 50–54 (60–90 CE). The *terminus ad quem* is established from the allusions to Heb 1:1–4 in 1 Clem. 36, usually dated around 96 CE (Holmes 2007: 35–36), although Attridge 1989: 7–8 favours a somewhat later date for Clement, around 120 CE.

66 An earlier version of what follows appeared in Church 2013b: 115–17. I deal with Heb 10:1–4 in greater detail in Chapter 8, below.

67 Attridge 1989: 8; Koester 2001: 52–53; Eisenbaum 2005: 213–37, esp. 225.

68 Josephus *Ant.* 3.102–187; 224–257; *Ag. Ap.* 2.77, 193–198; 1 Clem. 40–41; m. Qidd. 1.8.

69 Walker 1994: 58–59 (note 37); Hagner 2002: 25.

way, supplying the positive answer that the question in v. 2 (οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι; “would they not have ceased being offered?”) demands.

The present tense in Greek indicates an action viewed by a speaker as it unfolds, usually in the present time.⁷⁰ But since it is not always in the present time, lexical, contextual and grammatical factors as well as the features of the discourse must be considered.⁷¹ In the context of Heb 10:1–4, the question about the cessation of sacrifice makes it almost certain that the temple was still in place with the sacrifices still being offered.⁷²

The critique of the sacrificial system reappears in vv. 11–12, which refers to every priest who stands, “serving and offering the same sacrifices again and again” (λειτουργῶν καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας), and contrasts these sacrifices with the single sacrifice of Christ in the past. The station of the priests is expressed with the perfect indicative of ἵστημι (“to stand”) a verb form that elsewhere in the NT always indicates present time.⁷³ The text envisages these priests as standing and offering the same sacrifices, and contrasts them with the priest of the new covenant who, “having offered” (προσενέγκας, aorist participle) a single sacrifice, “sat down” (ἐκάθισεν, aorist indicative). To be sure the argument is about the ineffectiveness of the Levitical cultus, but there is no indication in the text that the reference is to be restricted to former priests standing either in the wilderness tabernacle or in the now destroyed temple. For that, one would expect a pluperfect. Indeed, Attridge’s rendering “the typical priest of old ‘has stood’ ” and Koester’s “every priest has stood” imply a pluperfect rather than a perfect and betray a preference for a date after 70 CE (although neither definitively discounts an earlier date).⁷⁴ Based on

70 Porter 1994b: 21; Wallace 1996: 514. Campbell 2007: 35–37 thinks that the present tense has no bearing on time, but that is surely an overstatement. Hughes 1977: 30–32 lists all the places where the author of Hebrews uses the present tense with reference to the temple and argues that they all indicate that the temple was still standing, but he too seems to overstate his case. See the critique in Porter 1994a: 296–98.

71 Porter 1993: 98–102; 1994a: 304–5.

72 Bruce 1990: 22; Walker 1996: 227–28; Motyer 2004: 188; Gordon 2008: 33; O’Brien 2010: 18–19.

73 Fanning 1990: 299 includes Heb 10:11 as an example of the use of the perfect indicative of ἵστημι to refer to the present. This verb form appears ten times in the NT (John 1:26; Acts 7:33; 26:6, 22; Rom 11:20; 1 Cor 7:37; 2 Tim 2:19; Heb 10:11; Jas 5:9; Rev 3:20) and a present time reference is always clear from the context. See the discussion in Wallace 1996: 579–80.

74 Attridge 1989: 279; Koester 2001: 430, 434, 440. For a past time reference with the pluperfect of ἵστημι see Matt 13:2; Luke 23:35; John 1:35; 18:5; 20:11. See the discussions of the date of Hebrews in Attridge 1989: 6–9, and Koester 2001: 50–54.

these considerations, I suggest, then, that the temple was still standing when Hebrews was written.

Hebrews and the Temple

Many scholars, including some who assign an early date, note that the author draws his arguments from the wilderness tabernacle and suggest that he displays no interest in the temple.⁷⁵ Others have challenged this suggestion, arguing that while the temple is not mentioned, it lies just beneath the surface.⁷⁶ There are several reasons for this. First, while the author's use of the concept of a heavenly temple is debated, the widespread recognition that the earthly and heavenly temples correspond in some way indicates that discussion of a heavenly temple also implies a discussion of the earthly temple.⁷⁷ Secondly, while the arguments of Hebrews are based on the wilderness tabernacle, these arguments are applied to the readers' contemporary situation.⁷⁸ Hebrews was not written in a vacuum. Discussion of the tabernacle as the dwelling place of God, as well as the use of the present tense in discussions of the Jewish cultus, would probably have evoked in the minds of the readers the contemporary, earthly manifestation of the dwelling place of God, that is the Jerusalem temple, irrespective of whether it was still standing or had been recently destroyed. Thirdly, since the most significant feature of Jerusalem in the first century was surely the temple, so much so that Jerusalem was seen not so much as city with a temple within it than a temple with a small city around it,⁷⁹ the implicit critique of Jerusalem in the later chapters of Hebrews (11:8–16; 12:22–24; 13:11–14) also implies a critique of the temple.⁸⁰

Motyer's conclusion is that Hebrews is written to persuade the readers to distance themselves from cultic practices associated with the temple, but that this is such a massive assault on the temple, had it been made explic-

75 Rissi 1987: 12; Attridge 1989: 8; Lindars 1989: 395, 403; Lane 1991a: lxii–lxiii; Isaacs 1992: 41–45; Ellingworth 1993: 401, 710; Eisenbaum 2005: 225–26; Aitken 2005: 134–35; Dunn 2006: 116; Lincoln 2006: 39–40; Mitchell 2007: 7; Schenck 2007: 195–98; O'Brien 2010: 18 (although he moderates this view on p. 19).

76 Walker 1994: 39–71; 1996: 205–7; 2004: 231–49; Motyer 2004: 177–89. Some earlier scholars also suggested that the tabernacle in Hebrews was a cipher for the temple. See Spicq 1952: 1: 253–61; Buchanan 1972: 256–63; Bruce 1990: 21–22.

77 Motyer 2004: 178.

78 Ibid.: 178.

79 Wright 1992: 225. On the centrality of the temple in Judaism in the first century, whether in Palestine or in the Diaspora see Johnson 2001: 43–46; VanderKam 2010b: 58–62; Levine 2010a: 796; 2010b: 1289–91.

80 Davies 1974: 152; Walker 1994: 45–50; Dunn 2006: 120.

itly it would have been rejected. As Motyer claims, there is no reference to the Jerusalem temple in Hebrews for rhetorical reasons, so that the “profound message . . . *about the Temple* may actually be heard . . . and not rejected out of hand.”⁸¹

Along these lines I will argue that, while the author of Hebrews never explicitly refers to the temple, several texts reflect a critique of temple, priesthood and sacrificial system.⁸² These, the author claims, are a symbolic foreshadowing of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, now come into the present with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. Since this is the case, the temple and its cultus must now be set aside.

The Relapse Theory

Discussion of the temple and temple symbolism raises the issue of the so-called relapse theory, that is, that the intended recipients of Hebrews were tempted to revert to Judaism from Christianity.⁸³ While it has some validity, this theory is fraught with problems. It seems clear that there were disputes between the earliest followers of Jesus and the Jewish authorities over the validity of the temple,⁸⁴ and that the followers of Jesus were sometimes excluded from synagogues.⁸⁵ On the other hand, the events recounted in Acts 13:14–16, which, while probably earlier than Hebrews by some decades, indicate that Paul and his companions were in the habit of attending and participating in synagogue worship. Moreover, it does seem clear that when Hebrews was written it was not yet possible to speak of two religions, Judaism and Christianity,

81 Motyer 2004: 189 (italics original). Motyer suggests that Heb 8:13; 9:1–10:18; 12:18–24; 13:10–16 could have been written with explicit reference to the temple, but that this would have amounted to “a massive ideological assault on the Jerusalem temple and cultus [which would have been] wholly counter-productive.” Since the temple was such a sensitive issue the author “proceeds cautiously and slowly, basing his arguments solidly on scripture, and allowing the implications to appear gradually and unobtrusively, but yet clearly” (p. 180). For similar arguments see Walker 2004: 239–40.

82 See the Introduction to Part 2 (below) as well as my treatment of Heb 8:3–5 in Chapter 8.

83 This view is adopted to some degree or another by Spicq 1952: 1: 228–29; Peterson 1982: 186; Bruce 1990: 100; Lehne 1990: 15–17; Lane 1991b: 545–46; Lindars 1991: 10–12; Ellingworth 1993: 78–80; Hagner 2002: 23; Salevao 2002: 108–18; Walker 2004: 235–46; Lincoln 2006: 57–60; Johnson 2006: 33–38; Mackie 2007: 13–15; Mitchell 2007: 11–13; O’Brien 2010: 9–13.

84 In Acts 6:13 Stephen is charged with speaking out “against [this] holy place” (κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου [τούτου]), that is, the temple (Metzger 1994: 298). Metzger discusses the evidence for the inclusion or exclusion of τούτου (“this”) in this expression, omitted as it is from P⁷⁴, 8, A, D, E, H and other later witnesses, but present in B, C and other witnesses.

85 John 9:22; 12:42; 16:42.

raising the further question of how it was possible to revert from one religion (Christianity) to the other (Judaism).

Nonetheless, James Dunn claims that “[f]or Hebrews and a Judaism still focussed on the Temple and its cult, the ways had already parted.”⁸⁶ Dunn’s opinion that, “the great body of Jews who continued to value and cherish the cult . . . must have felt deeply alienated by such a writing,”⁸⁷ makes sense. Thus, while there may have not been a final parting of the ways until much later, there were people and places where the ways seem to have parted from the very early period.⁸⁸ For this reason, I propose a modified relapse theory. References to Judaism and Christianity are anachronistic in the context of Hebrews, and there is neither polemic against “Judaism” *per se*, nor any reference to an entity called “Christianity.” On the other hand, the text argues that the former covenant and its associated cultus were valid for their time as pointers to what was to come, and now that the “time of reformation” (καὶρὸς διορθώσεως, 9:10) has come, these must give way to that which they anticipated. Nevertheless, the exhortation is not to follow another, new religion, but to follow Jesus (12:1–2; 13:14), one who arose from the tribe of Judah (7:14), and in whom God’s plans to liberate the descendants of Abraham are centred (2:16). Jesus and his sacrifice do not so much replace the temple cult of Judaism, as bring it to its *telos* (8:13; 10:5–10). Now that this *telos* has come with exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God (1:3; 8:1), for his followers to devote themselves to the former cultus is to run the danger of holding him in contempt (6:6) and laying themselves open to the judgment of God (10:26–31).⁸⁹

86 Dunn 2006: 121 (italics original). See also the discussion of evidence for separation in Kim 2006: 49–52. Kim concludes that Hebrews “marks the stage of a maturing Christianity that is more independent from Judaism.”

87 Dunn 2006: 121.

88 Several scholars argue that Hebrews addressed the issue of Christian identity over against pagan Rome, “when Rome was the common enemy of Jews and believers in Jesus and before the rhetoric of Christian and Jewish leaders could construct firm boundaries between Judaism and Christianity” (Eisenbaum 2005: 237). A similar view is proposed by Käsemann 1984: 24–25 (who thinks the relapse theory is a “fantasy”); Koester 2001: 64–79; DeSilva 2000b: 2–7; Thompson 2008: 6–10. None of these scholars adequately deals with the reasons why the author almost exclusively bases his arguments on aspects of the Jewish cultus. I discuss this more fully in Chapter 7, below.

89 Kim 2006: 201 denies any supersessionism in Hebrews, seeing rather the argument that God in his “great love for his [Jewish] people . . . has provided a superior way by which his people can draw near to him” (p. 201). See the comprehensive discussion in Hays 2009: 151–73.

Organisation

Part 2 of this study is an exegetical treatment of those parts of Hebrews where temple symbolism appears. But, because there was considerable speculation about a heavenly temple in the literature of the Second Temple period, it is necessary to examine other texts from this period that reflect temple symbolism. This body of literature is considerable and some organisational principle is necessary. I treat it in four chapters, on the basis of the attitude to the temple reflected in the texts under discussion. In chapter 2, I discuss texts that portray a positive attitude to the temple. In chapter 3, I discuss temple symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, texts used by a community that had withdrawn from the temple, believing that it and its priesthood were corrupt. Belief in a corrupt priesthood and temple seems also to be reflected in another body of texts that has much to say about a heavenly temple, mostly ignoring the Jerusalem temple.⁹⁰ I discuss this material in chapter 4, followed in chapter 5 by a discussion of texts post-dating the fall of the temple and responding to that event.⁹¹

The justification for examining these texts is twofold. First, they represent an important part of the environment of the primitive church. Secondly, all of these texts (including Hebrews) represent varying approaches to understanding the OT, whether in Hebrew or in Greek. This examination therefore provides the necessary background to the study of Hebrews, where the community addressed seems to have a positive opinion of the temple, but where the author considered that, while the temple was formerly valid as a pointer to the eschatological events that have now come with the exaltation of Christ, it had now reached its *telos*, and God was no longer to be encountered there.

90 There was considerable disappointment with the second temple from the start, a phenomenon reflected in such texts as Hag 2:1–3; Mal 1:6–2:9; 1 Esd 5:63–65; 1 En. 89:73; Josephus *Ant.* 11.80–81. This disappointment is implicit in many of the texts I discuss in chapter 4, and leads to the idea of a heavenly temple as the true temple. See Zimmer 1975: 42–43; Segal 1986: 39–40, 80, 128–30.

91 Strictly speaking the literature discussed in chapter 5 falls outside the Second Temple period. I include it because it does reflect varying attitudes to the temple, even after its destruction by the Romans. Isaacs 1992: 67 is virtually alone in her conclusion that Hebrews was written to “Christians of a Jewish origin . . . [who] would have mourned the loss of Jerusalem.” On this cf. Davidson 1959: 21, who notes “no historical evidence” of any despair on the part of Jewish Christians at the loss of the temple. See also Lampe 1984: 153–71.

Intertextuality

The word “intertextuality,” that is, the study of relationships between texts,⁹² arises from time to time in this study. Although I do not make use of this to any great extent I need to clarify the sense in which I use the word. This discussion is necessary because the term is used differently in biblical studies than in literary and linguistic studies, where it is associated with poststructuralism and deconstruction. In those disciplines, intertextuality is primarily associated with literary critics such as Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva who coined the term,⁹³ and Mikhail Bakhtin. Hatina defines such intertextuality as “a concept that disclosed every text’s dependence on and infiltration by prior codes and concepts.”⁹⁴ Kristeva cites Bakhtin as situating “the text within history and society, which are then seen as texts read by the writer, and into which he inserts himself by rewriting them.”⁹⁵ Thus, intertextuality in these terms “concerns itself with the relations among many texts . . . [and] is a synchronic, reader-oriented, semiotic method.”⁹⁶

Patricia Tull Willey demonstrates with the expression, “No text is an island,” that a text never stands alone, but is always part of an ongoing conversation.⁹⁷ In the context of this study, it is important to acknowledge that there was a continuing conversation about the temple in Second Temple Judaism, and, since Hebrews is part of that conversation, other conversation partners need to be listened to, although without expecting the author of Hebrews to say the same things as they do and without suggesting that he was dependent upon these other works. Indeed, it is unlikely that the author of Hebrews will say the same things, since he has an entirely different starting point—the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God signalling the irruption of the eschaton into the present. Intertextuality in these terms is reflected in my examination of texts other than Hebrews.⁹⁸ Moreover, whether the author of Hebrews was

92 Vorster 1989: 18.

93 Kristeva 1986: 36–37.

94 Hatina 1999: 31.

95 Kristeva 1986: 36. In this quote, “history” and “society” are understood as texts.

96 Sommer 1998: 7.

97 Willey 1997: 58–60. Willey borrowed the example from Miscal 1992: 45 and Beal 1992: 23. English speaking readers will recognise the echo of a line from John Donne, “no man is an Island, intire of it selfe (sic).” Cf. also Culler 2001: 114 who refers to intertextuality as “a designation of [a work’s] participation in the discursive space of a culture.”

98 Sommer 1998: 7 also notes that connections between texts can result from “the way that expressions in a given text reflect linguistic, esthetic, cultural, or ideological contexts of the text at hand: other texts may share those contexts, and hence links among many texts

familiar with these texts or not is irrelevant; they reflect ideas “in the air” when Hebrews was written.⁹⁹

In biblical studies intertextuality is normally used differently, that is, “as a substitute category for uncovering and investigating conscious or unconscious allusions to scripture in the New Testament.”¹⁰⁰ In this context intertextuality refers to the way a subsequent author makes use of a previously written text.¹⁰¹ This diachronic methodology, which Sommer refers to as “allusion and influence,”¹⁰² is a much narrower discipline, looking for “specific connections between a limited number of texts.”¹⁰³ I will mainly use the term intertextuality in this sense.¹⁰⁴ In places my work depends upon the work of Richard B. Hays, who has demonstrated the value of reading OT intertextual references in the NT in the light of their wider OT context,¹⁰⁵ and Craig Evans, who suggests that it is not only the OT context that needs to be considered, but also the OT text as interpreted “in late antiquity.”¹⁰⁶

When understood in this way, intertextuality operates on a variety of levels. Hebrews contains numerous direct quotations from the OT. Some are simple to identify, especially those that appear with a citation formula, such as the appearance of some form of the word λέγω immediately prior to words that can be identified as coming from the LXX (e.g. 1:6, 7; 2:6, 12; 3:7). Where a

-
- may be noticed, whether the authors of these texts knew each other or not.” I also recognise that in this discussion “text” refers to more than a written document and includes the influences that make up a written text as well as those that grow out of it as others read it.
- 99 Eco 1979: 169–70 refers to intertextual echoes in Fleming’s James Bond novels as influences that “may have worked in the mind of the author without emerging into consciousness . . . devices that he had smelled in the air.”
- 100 Hatina 1999: 28.
- 101 This approach is sometimes referred to as “inner-biblical exegesis.” Other scholars that exploit this kind of intertextuality include Fishbane 1985; Sommer 1998.
- 102 Sommer 1998: 8.
- 103 Ibid.: 8.
- 104 See the discussion in Hays 1989: 15–16, who recognises the value of investigations that use the notion of intertextuality in the wider sense, but uses the term “in a more limited sense, focusing on . . . [Paul’s] actual citations of and allusions to specific texts.”
- 105 Ibid.; See also Hays 2005. Along the same lines Pattemore 2004: 38 argues that since a prior text quoted in a later text is part of the “mutual cognitive environment” of the author and readers of that later text, “sensitivity to the wider context of the original setting of a quotation is . . . a necessary hermeneutical strategy.”
- 106 Evans 1993: 50. The term “late antiquity” normally refers to a period later than Second Temple Judaism, the period to which I restrict this study.

citation formula is absent, substantial identity with a passage from the LXX may indicate a direct quotation (e.g. 7:1–3).¹⁰⁷

In addition to quotations, scholars have identified a number of allusions to the LXX, although the identification of these is more difficult, not least because of the debate as to the amount of material to be included before an allusion is identified.¹⁰⁸ With Guthrie, I recognise as an allusion “an overt weaving of at least a phrase from the antecedent text into the author’s own language.”¹⁰⁹ There is usually no formal marker in the syntax to indicate that words from another source are being used, and at times the forms of the words used are changed so as to fit the syntax in the new author’s discourse.

In addition to direct quotations and allusions, scholars also refer to echoes, the identification of which is more difficult still. Indeed, the subliminal nature of some intertextual echoes may mean that their number cannot be definitively quantified.¹¹⁰ In this regard Hays distinguishes “allusive echo” from quotation and overt allusion. He proposes that an allusive echo suggests to the reader that “text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed.”¹¹¹ Further, since the discerning of an intertextual echo is by nature reader-oriented, it may be that the more familiar one becomes with a text and the background of the interpretive tradition in which it stands, the more echoes may be discerned. Nevertheless, it is important to be alert for echoes, for, as Hays has demonstrated, they can considerably enhance the reader’s understanding of a text.¹¹²

107 See the discussion in Fitzmyer 1997: 7–14. On p. 14 Fitzmyer refers to citations with no citation formula as “virtual citations.” See also Stanley 1992: 33–37; Gheorghita 2003: 32–35.

108 Longenecker 1975: 166–67 includes single words and identifies fifty five allusions in Hebrews.

109 Guthrie 2003, *ibid.*: 273. The distinction between a direct quotation and an allusion is clarified by comparing Heb 1:13 with Heb 1:3. In Heb 1:13 there is a quotation from Ps 110:1 that conforms to the extant text of the LXX (neither Rahlfs 1931: 276–77, nor NA²⁸ note any variant readings in either Ps 109:1 [LXX] nor Heb 1:13). The quotation in v. 13 is introduced with a rhetorical question that serves as a citation formula. In v. 3 (NRSV) the words, “he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,” clearly bear some relationship to Ps 110:1. But the imperative in the Psalm is expressed as an indicative, “the Lord” (YHWH) of the Psalm is described as “the Majesty on high,” and the exaltation of the Son to God’s right hand appears to be in response to the command in the Psalm.

110 Guthrie 2003: 274.

111 Hays 1989: 20. For an example of echoes along these lines see my discussion of the influence of Balaam’s oracles on Hebrews in Church 2008: 154–57.

112 Hays 1993, *passim*.

Summary

This study is concerned with temple symbolism in Hebrews. This includes explicit references to the wilderness tabernacle and the heavenly temple, implicit references to the Jerusalem temple, and the relationship between earthly sanctuaries and the heavenly temple. Many readers of Hebrews understand the text to suggest that earthly sanctuaries are copies of the archetypal heavenly sanctuary, but I propose a reading in which earthly sanctuaries anticipate the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, pictured in Hebrews as a heavenly, eschatological temple.

Before I approach the text of Hebrews, I examine temple symbolism in the literature of Second Temple Judaism with several questions in mind. These questions include whether the heavenly temple is envisaged anywhere as a heavenly counterpart of the earthly temple, so that the notion of “copy” and “shadow” can be used of the earthly temple; whether the wilderness tabernacle is ever disparaged in this literature, as has often been proposed for Hebrews; whether the heavenly temple is anywhere understood as a place of sacrifice, especially blood sacrifice; and whether the heavenly temple is understood as the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people, and if so, whether it is accessible to the earthly community prior to the eschaton. Answering these questions will assist in the understanding of the temple symbolism of Hebrews.

PART 1

*Attitudes to the Temple in the Literature
of Second Temple Judaism*



Introduction to Part 1

In Part 1 I examine several texts from the literature of the Second Temple period, analysed by the attitudes to the temple reflected in these texts. In chapter 2 I examine texts which portray a positive attitude to the temple. These texts are Sirach, The Letter of Aristeas, Wisdom, Book 3 of the Sibylline Oracles, certain texts from Philo, and 2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse). In two places the language of imitation appears, something often argued for Heb 8:5, although the language is quite different. In some texts the temple has cosmic features as a microcosm of the universe; there is a heavenly temple in 2 Enoch but it bears little resemblance to the earthly temple; and some texts imply an eschatological temple with a return to the conditions of Eden, with eschatology resembling protology.

In chapter 3 I turn to the Dead Sea Scrolls, where it is clear that the second temple had been rejected by the community reflected in these documents. I discuss those texts which anticipate an eschatological temple that God was expected to build in the last days (4QFlorilegium, 11QTemple and the New Jerusalem Scroll), those texts which envisage the community as a temple (1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, 4QInstruction) and those texts which envisage the community worshiping with the angels, either in the heavenly temple, or in the Judean desert (1QH^a, 1QSB, 4QBerakhot, 4QDaily Prayers, the Songs of the Sage and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice). In these texts, where a “temple” appears to replace the rejected temple in Jerusalem, it is a symbol for the dwelling of God with his people, either in the present within the community, or in the eschaton. In some texts this heavenly temple encompasses heaven and earth.

In chapter 4 I deal with texts which display dissatisfaction with the temple. Here I discuss parts of 1 Enoch, Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In many places the Second Temple in Jerusalem is simply ignored. The tabernacle and Solomon’s temple are revered as ideal sanctuaries, but the Second Temple is passed over in silence. The dissatisfaction seems to stem from the corrupt priesthood rather than the temple *per se*. Some texts anticipate an eschatological temple where God will dwell with his people, and where this is the case it envisages a return to the conditions of Eden. Sometimes the eschatological temple seems to be a structure in Jerusalem, and elsewhere it is a metaphorical temple.

Finally, I examine several texts that respond to the fall of the temple in 70 CE. Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch are apocalyptic texts which treat the fall of the temple as though it was Solomon’s temple, and a great tragedy. The second temple is all but ignored. Third Baruch has a similar approach,

but here the temple is decisively rejected. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the temple is destroyed because of idolatry. *Pseudo-Philo* contains diverse material, but never refers to the Second Temple. It anticipates an eschatological temple following the destruction of Solomon's temple: a heavenly temple to be built by God, corresponding to the protological Eden sanctuary. Book 4 of the *Sibylline Oracles* contains diverse material. Sometimes the destruction of the temple is attributed to idolatry, and elsewhere it seems that the entire enterprise of temple and cultus is misguided. In Book 5, the Second Temple is specifically mentioned. It is destroyed by Nero, but in retribution for this, Rome will be destroyed and an eschatological redeemer will arise to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, where all the nations will come to worship God. The *Ladder of Jacob* attributes the fall of the temple to the wickedness of the people, as does *Josephus*. When *Josephus* discusses the tabernacle and Solomon's temple they are revered as ideal sanctuaries.

Temple Affirmed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting a Positive Attitude to the Temple

Introduction

In this chapter I examine several texts from the Second Temple period that portray a positive attitude to the temple. These texts include the Letter of Aristeas, an apology for Judaism that presents Judaism and the temple in a very positive light; Sirach, where the universe appears as a temple, with the Jerusalem temple understood as a microcosm of that; Wisdom, where “Solomon” builds the temple as a “copy of the holy tent God had prepared from the beginning”; Sibylline Oracles Book 3 where the sibyllist anticipated the rebuilding of the temple after the exile, so that everything would be “as before”; Philo, who attributed cosmic significance to the design of the tabernacle; and 2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse), in which Enoch begins a heavenly journey from Akhuzan (Zion), the centre of the earth, and who, in a set of ethical instructions, enjoins the proper observance of the sacrificial cultus of the temple.

An examination of these texts is warranted, since, while they portray a different attitude to the temple from that evident in Hebrews, the theoretical basis of these positive attitudes can give valuable insights into the understanding of Hebrews. And, while many of the texts I discuss in chapters 3–5 do not explicitly mention the temple, these texts all refer to the temple and provide evidence of positive discourse about the temple.

Sirach

Ben Sira composed Sirach in Hebrew in the first quarter of the second century BCE, and his grandson translated it into Greek in Egypt some sixty or seventy years later.¹ Much of the work comprises thematically grouped sentence

¹ Nickelsburg 2005: 62–63; Wright 2010: 436–37. The history of the transmission of the text is complex (*ibid.*: 437). There are two versions of the Greek text, with the shorter considered more original. Since the late nineteenth century parts of the Hebrew text have been discovered, including medieval manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, and fragments from Masada and Qumran, also in two versions. About two thirds of the text is available in Hebrew, and

literature on a variety of ethical and religious subjects. There are several longer poems, and the final chapters comprise a hymn in praise of famous men, culminating with the high priest Simon II, Ben Sira's near contemporary.²

Ben Sira had a positive view of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.³ This is especially clear in chapters 44–50, where Aaron and Phinehas feature prominently in the hymn in praise of the ancestors and Simon features in the climactic chapter 50. Temple symbolism appears in chapter 24, a poem in praise of wisdom, no longer extant in Hebrew,⁴ and in parts of the song of praise of the ancestors (44–50). There are indications that some NT writers, particularly Matthew (or perhaps Q), James and possibly the author of Hebrews were familiar with Sirach, at least in its Greek form.⁵

has been compiled by Beentjes 1997, from which I reference the Hebrew text. The Hebrew manuscripts are also available online at <http://www.bensira.org/>. Accessed 3 August 2016. Latin and Syriac versions are also extant. For discussions of the transmission history, see Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 51–61. The upheavals of 175–164 BCE occurred between the original composition and the Greek translation, but apart from the prayer in Sir 36, which is of doubtful provenance, the text seems oblivious to these events (Collins 1997b: 25). In what follows I refer to the book as “Sirach” and to the author as “Ben Sira.”

- 2 Simon died in 196 BCE. VanderKam 2004: 149–57 argues that the historical detail in the book indicates that the reference is to Simon I, approximately one century earlier. This discussion is outside my scope.
- 3 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 87–88; Wright 1997: 190–96; 2007a: 171; Boccaccini 1998: 68; Ego 1999: 205. See Sir 7:29–31; 24:10–11; 49:12. As Olyan 1987: 267–76 points out, Aaron and his descendants are true priests in Sirach. The priesthood of Levi (see Jer 33:17–22; Mal 2:4–9, Jub. 32 and T. Levi) is ignored, and Levi only appears in 45:6 as a tribal name, possibly reflecting inter-priestly conflict (Hengel 1974: 2: 38–39, note 385, and see the example of such conflict in Josephus, *Ant* 20.216–218). Himmelfarb 2002: 134 suggests that Ben Sira was not “an apologist for the priestly establishment,” rather he gave an ideal picture as a way of presenting a critique of that establishment. But Himmelfarb seems to be operating on the principle that the absence of smoke implies a well-hidden fire, for no critique of temple or priesthood appears anywhere in this text. Of course an apologist, advocating a position, can also be a critic, see Wright 2007a: 171 (note 35), but this seems not to be the case with Ben Sira.
- 4 For a proposed retroversion into Hebrew see Skehan 1979: 374–79.
- 5 Box and Oesterley 1913: 294–96. Heb 12:12 cites a line from Isa 35:3 in a form identical to Sir 25:23, but different from the LXX of Isaiah. NA²⁸ (pp. 872–73) detects allusions to Sir 2:2 in Heb 11:27; Sir 17:17 in Heb 2:5; Sir 25:23 in Heb 12:12; Sir 29:14–20 in Heb 7:22; Sir 33:19 in Heb 13:7; Sir 44:16 in Heb 11:5; Sir 44:17 in Heb 11:7; Sir 44:20 in Heb 11:17; Sir 44:21 in Heb 11:12. Most of these are single words with doubtful significance. Matt 11:25–30 may reflect Sirach's influence, with the marginal notes in NA²⁸ indicating several allusions to different parts of the book.

The Praise of Wisdom (Sir 24:1–33)

This chapter, perhaps a centrepiece to the book,⁶ comprises an introduction (vv. 1–2), followed by a poem of six stanzas.⁷ Wisdom speaks in the first person in vv. 3–22. Verse 23 is a prose introduction to the fifth stanza (vv. 23–39) in which Wisdom is associated with Torah. Ben Sira himself speaks in vv. 30–33, explaining his part in the transmission of Wisdom. This poem covers similar ground to Prov 8, but while the structure of the two poems is similar, there are considerable differences in content.⁸ Temple symbolism pervades the poem, particularly in allusions to the Eden story, the wilderness wanderings, and to the priestly role of Wisdom in the Jerusalem temple.

Verse 1 locates Wisdom “among her people” (ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ αὐτῆς), and v. 2 locates her “in the assembly of the Most High” (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑψίστου) and “in the presence of his host” (ἐναντὶ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ).⁹ These expressions could refer either to angels or to the human community or to both, the latter in v. 1 and the former in v. 2.¹⁰

Scholars most commonly identify the people of God among whom Wisdom is located in v. 1 as Israel at worship in the temple,¹¹ and they often consider that the expressions “the assembly of the Most High” and “his host” in v. 2 locate Wisdom in the heavenly temple among the angels.¹² While the “assembly of the Most High” (ἐκκλησία ὑψίστου, v. 2) could be identified as the heavenly council as in Ps 82:1 (συναγωγή θεῶν (LXX 81:1), “gathering of the gods”), or Ps 89:6 (ἐκκλησία ἁγίων (LXX 88:7), “assembly of the holy ones”), the genitives in both expressions

6 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331; Mulder 2003: 26; Harrington 2005: 103.

7 The Greek text also includes verse 34, but the Hebrew ms E from the Cairo Genizah shows that this has been displaced from 33:18. See Skehan 1979: 375–76. Perdue 1994: 264 suggests that in this chapter “Wisdom is personified as a heavenly goddess.” Others have compared the poem with the Egyptian Aretologies of the goddess Isis, see Collins 1997b: 49–50. For a critique of this comparison see Sanders 1983: 45–50.

8 Skehan 1979: 375; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331. On the differences see Marböck 1971: 55–56; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 72.

9 I defend this translation below. An alternative rendering could be “in the presence of his power.”

10 Rickenbacher 1973: 118–19 sets out the options and lists those scholars who subscribe to them.

11 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331; Collins 1997a: 50; Schreiner 2002: 129. Smend 1906: 216 suggests that the “people” are the angels. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 283 notes with reference to 4Q400 1 i 6 that “it is extremely unlikely that a group of angels would ever be called a people.”

12 Rickenbacher 1973: 119; Snaith 1974: 120–21; Perdue 1994: 267; Schreiner 2002: 129; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331–32. Perdue 1977: 189 has Wisdom “hypostatized as a member of the divine court of the Most High.”

from the Psalms describe those included in the gathering or assembly, whereas the genitive in Sir 24:2 describes the congregation as belonging to God (ὁ ὑψιστος).¹³ While this precise expression appears only here in the LXX, God's people are referred to as the congregation of YHWH in several texts in the OT,¹⁴ and in several places in Sirach ἐκκλησία refers to an earthly congregation.¹⁵ The assembly of the Most High is therefore likely to further describe the people of God.

On the other hand, the third expression ("in the presence of his host") probably refers to the heavenly host, with the Hebrew *Vorlage* for δύνάμεις αὐτοῦ ("his host") understood as צבאו. This is the sense that it has in Sir 17:32 where δύνάμιν ὑψους οὐρανοῦ ("the host of the highest heaven") refers to angels over against "all people" (ἄνθρωποι πάντες) in the other line of the verse.¹⁶ Thus, these verses contain two descriptions of the human community and one of the heavenly host.

- 13 The term ὑψιστος seems to be the translator's preferred epithet for God. See Sir 4:10; 7:9, 15; 9:15; 12:2, 6; 17:26, 27; 19:17; 23:18, 23; 24:2, 3, 23; 26:16; 28:7; 29:11; 33:15; 34:6, 19; 35:5, 9, 19; 37:15; 38:2; 39:1, 5; 41:4, 8; 43:2, 9, 12; 44:20; 46:5; 47:5, 8; 48:5; 49:4; 50:7, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21. Not all of these instances are preserved in Hebrew. In 37:15; 38:2; 43:12 the Hebrew simply reads אֱל ("God"); in 41:4, 8; 43:2; 44:20; 49:4; 50:14, 16 it is עֲלִיּוֹן ("Most High"); in 43:9 it is מְרוֹמֵי אֱל ("the exalted God"); in 46:5; 47:5, 8 it is אֱל עֲלִיּוֹן ("God Most High"); in 50:7 it is הַמֶּלֶךְ ("the king"); and in 50:19 כָּל עַם הָאָרֶץ ("all the people of the land") are ὁ λαὸς κυρίου ὑψίστου ("the people of the Lord Most High").
- 14 Deut 23:2, 3, 4, 9; 1 Chr 28:8; Mic 2:5. See also Lam 1:10.
- 15 Sir 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 26:5; 31:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; 50:13, 20. This is not to suggest that the grandson of Ben Sira used the LXX in any consistent manner as a basis for his translation from Hebrew into Greek (Wright 1989: 173–75).
- 16 צבא appears in the singular in Ps 148:2 (MT כָּל צְבָאוֹ, LXX πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ) and 2 Chr 18:18 (MT כָּל צְבֵאֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם, LXX πᾶσα δὲ δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) to refer to YHWH's heavenly host. Another possibility for Sir 24:2 is חֵילוֹ, which refers to God's army in Joel 2:11. In Jer 16:21 δύνάμεις renders גְּבוּרָה referring to "might," "strength" or God's "great deeds," but while this is a possibility for Sir 24:2 and while δύνάμεις has this sense in Sir 6:26; 7:30 (Heb מְאֹד); 8:13; 29:20; 44:3 (Heb גְּבוּרָה); 46:5, the context in 17:32 and 24:2 seems to indicate a reference to angelic beings. The NRSV reads Sir 24:2 a reference to the heavenly council, although it renders δύνάμεις as a plural ("in the presence of his hosts"). Since there is no extant Hebrew text for Sir 24:2, and since Ps 148:2 and 2 Chr 18:18 are instances of both the singular and the plural forms of δύνάμεις rendering the singular צבא in the LXX, Zsengellér 2008: 139 is on precarious ground when he argues from a putative Hebrew text that, since δύνάμεις is singular and צבאות plural, and since the plural of צבא does not appear elsewhere in the Hebrew text of Sirach or in the biblical wisdom literature, these verses should be rendered "in the presence of his power," and that they describe "a liturgical situation that can only exist in the temple." Skehan 1979: 374 retroverts this expression into Hebrew with וּנְגַד צְבָאוֹ ("in the presence of his host").

In Sir 24:3–7; 8–12 Wisdom recounts her search for a resting place, culminating in the Jerusalem temple in vv. 10–12 where she ministered before YHWH. Since she now speaks (vv. 1–2) from there, and since this is in the presence both of God's people and the heavenly host, this text witnesses to an understanding of the temple as “heaven on earth.” When Wisdom speaks from the temple she speaks in the presence of both the earthly community of God's people and of the heavenly host.¹⁷

This merging of heaven and earth continues in the opening stanza of the hymn (24:3–7), where Wisdom speaks of her origin in the mouth of God, an allusion to the creative word of Gen 1.¹⁸ Like the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים (“spirit/wind of God”) of Gen 1:2 and the mist of Gen 2:6, Wisdom covers the earth like a mist (24:3), encircles the vault of heaven and “walks around” (περιπατέω) the depths of the abyss.¹⁹ In v. 4 Wisdom exclaims that she has “pitched her tent in the heights” (ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα) and, in an allusion to the wilderness wanderings, claims that her “throne was in a pillar of cloud” (ὁ θρόνος μου ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης). Like YHWH (also enthroned in heaven), who “preceded his people” (לִפְנֵיהֶם הָלַךְ, Exod 13:21) in the pillar of cloud and whose presence was symbolised in the cloud (Exod 40:34–38), Wisdom's dwelling encompasses both heaven and earth.²⁰

The stanza ends with Wisdom seeking a “resting place” (ἀνάπαυσις) and an “inheritance” (κληρονομία).²¹ The next stanza (vv. 8–12) describes the resting place and the inheritance. The former is in a tent (σκηνή) and the latter in

17 For a similar phenomenon see Solomon's dedicatory prayer in 1 Kings 8; 2 Chr 6, where there is an interplay between God's dwelling in heaven and his dwelling in the temple.

18 Sheppard 1980: 22–27; Gese 1981a: 196; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 332–33; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 60.

19 For echoes of the creation story here, as well as the mist of Gen 2:6 watering the earth, see Sheppard 1980: 22–27; Perdue 1994: 267; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 80–81. Gese 1981a: 196, followed by Fletcher-Louis 2002: 77 and 2004: 83–84, points out that the vault of heaven and depth of the abyss are the upper and lower extremities of the earth as described in Gen 1:6–8. There are also a number of linguistic connections between Sir 24:3–7 and Job 38 where God interrogates Job as to his involvement in creation. The mist ὑμίχλη (Sir 24:3) appears in Job 38:9; the waves (Sir 24:6) appear in Job 38:11; and in Job 38:16 God asks Job if he has “traversed” (Hithpael of הָלַךְ, LXX περιπατέω) the “abyss” (תְּהוֹם, LXX ἄβυσσος) as Wisdom claims for herself in Sir 24:5.

20 See Sheppard 1980: 31, “Wisdom's encampment . . . involves the old problem of where the creator of the earth can dwell—in the heavens or in the man-made temple, or both.”

21 Collins 1997b: 51. Sheppard 1980: 39 compares this with the wilderness wanderings of Israel looking for rest in the promised land. This is possible, but God's rest on the seventh day is more likely, given the creation symbolism in the chapter. Moreover, it is not God's people seeking rest, but Wisdom. See the discussion in Fletcher-Louis 2004: 86–87.

Israel (v. 8).²² Temple symbolism becomes explicit in v. 10 where Wisdom “ministered before him in the holy tent and was established in Zion” (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐλειτούργησα καὶ οὕτως ἐν Σιων ἐστηρίχθην). In v. 11 God gave Wisdom a resting place in the beloved city, and her authority was in Jerusalem (ἐν πόλει ἡγαπημένῃ ὁμοίως με κατέπαυσεν, καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ἡ ἐξουσία μου). Thus Wisdom has a central place in the cult of Israel, and carries on a priestly ministry “in the holy tent” (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ), that is the Jerusalem temple.²³ Hence, as well as echoing God’s rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2:1–3), the text also echoes God’s rest in the temple (2 Chr 6:41; Ps 132:8, 14) and the notion of the temple as a microcosm of the cosmos, as in the Priestly source of the Pentateuch.²⁴

Verse 12 provides a transition to the next stanza with the introduction of horticultural symbolism. Here, Wisdom takes on the likeness of a variety of trees: cedars, cypresses, palms, roses, olive trees and others.²⁵ That these are the trees of Eden is indicated in v. 19 where all who desire wisdom are invited to come and eat of her fruit (cf. Gen 2:16); in the fifth stanza where Wisdom, now associated with Torah,²⁶ is likened to six rivers, including the four rivers of

22 This is quite different from 1 En. 42:1–2, where Wisdom finds no resting place on earth and returns to heaven. While Boccaccini 1998: 146 suggests that this is polemic against the “sapiential myth of the torah as the earthly embodiment of heavenly wisdom,” another explanation can be found in the attitudes to the temple in the two works. Dissatisfaction with temple emerges in 1 Enoch, while Sirach reflects a positive attitude to the temple, making it quite in order for Wisdom to take up residence there.

23 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 333 claim that the tent is the tabernacle, referring to Exod 25:8–9; 26:1–37. In a sense that is correct, but the references to Zion and Jerusalem imply the temple. See Gese 1981b: 34; Wright 1997: 195. Note the series of prepositional phrases in verses 10–12 emphasising the centrality of Jerusalem (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ... ἐν Σιων... ἐν πόλει ἡγαπημένῃ... ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ... ἐν λαῷ δεδοξασμένῳ, ἐν μερίδι κυρίου, “... in the holy tent... in the beloved city... in Jerusalem... among an honoured people, in the Lord’s portion”). Sheppard 1980: 48–49 finds echoes of Exod 15:17; Deut 12:5–7, 11–14 (the place where YHWH chose to set his name). See also Ps 78:60–71; 132:11–18. I argue in Church 2013b: 119–20 that the reference to the “tent” in Heb 13:10 is an archaised reference to the temple.

24 Blenkinsopp 1976: 275–83; Kearney 1977: 375–87; Weinfeld 1981: 501–12; Levenson 1984: 286–89; 1985: 142–45; 1988a: 84–86; Wenham 1986: 23; Janowski 1990: 37–69; Parry 1994: 126–51; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 58–60; 2004: 77–79; Ruiten 2007: 72.

25 These verses echo “every kind of tree” (Gen 2:11–12), see Perdue 1994, Fletcher-Louis 2002: 77. For similar lists of trees see Hos 14:4–9; Deut 8:7–10. In Ps 92:13–14; Isa 60:13; Ezek 40:16, 22, 26; 41:18–25 trees are associated with the temple.

26 Skehan and Di Lella 1987 suggest that Wisdom is identified with Torah, as do Himmelfarb 1993: 82; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 52, and Hayward 1992b: 127 (“Wisdom is none other than the Torah herself”). The relationship is more nuanced than this would suggest,

Eden (Pishon, Gihon, Tigris and Euphrates) the Nile and the Jordan;²⁷ and in v. 28, which mentions the first man who did not fully know wisdom.²⁸

Aromatic spices appear in v. 15 and “the odour of incense in the tent” (λίβανου ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ). These spices echo the spices used to anoint the tent of meeting and its furnishings, as well as Aaron and his sons (Exod 30:23–38), and could only be used for liturgical purposes (Exod 33:38).²⁹ The poem ends with Ben Sira himself taking the part of Adam, “the gardener and guardian of the world’s irrigation system,”³⁰ spreading wisdom to future generations and ultimately to all who seek wisdom.

The combination of creation and temple themes in this poem reflects the understanding that the creation of the cosmos in Gen 1 and the construction of the tabernacle in Exod 25–30 are related. Thus, the cosmos in Gen 1 and the Garden of Eden in Gen 2 are understood as archetypal sanctuaries.³¹ Similar imagery with trees and rivers is echoed in Balaam’s fourth oracle (Num 24:5–7), where God’s people are pictured encamped in an Edenic setting around the wilderness tabernacle. This text, probably echoed here,³² also surfaces

see Stordalen 2000: 423. Rogers 2004: 115–17 concludes, “Law gives expression to Wisdom, and is thus in its entirety characterised by it. But Wisdom exists before and beyond Law, and is not fully exhausted by it.” That the rivers describe Torah rather than Wisdom is seen in masculine pronouns in vv. 25–27, agreeing with the “book of the covenant of the Most High God” (βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου) and the law commanded by Moses (νόμος ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς), while Wisdom (σοφία) is feminine. Ego 1999: 208–9; and Zsengellér 2008: 140 refer to the river flowing out of the temple in Ezek 47: 1–12, and Zsengellér concludes that in this chapter of Sirach the temple is a “place where wisdom as Torah and teaching can flow out and make land and people prosper, in and outside of Israel.”

27 Stordalen 2000: 422–23 discusses the order of the rivers here, and the inclusion of the Jordan and the Nile. Sheppard 1980: 68–71 notes that the Edenic rivers, Pishon and Gihon, form an inclusio around the list. See also Hayward 1991: 26–27; Ego 1999: 206–9; Rogers 2004; Ruiten 2007: 70 (who suggests that “[t]he first and the last river bracket the rest of the rivers to make them appear as additional streams of paradise”).

28 Koester 1989: 25; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 75 (note 63). The words “shame” and “sin” in Sir 24:22 echo Gen 3.

29 For the blending of Exod 30:23, 34 in Sir 24:15 see Sheppard 1980: 57–60. Zsengellér 2008: 139 suggests that here “wisdom is acting as the incense of the service” and takes on a priestly function.

30 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 79. Note v. 30 where Ben Sira compares himself to “a water-channel into a garden” (παράδεισος).

31 Koester 1989: 24–25.

32 Beale 2004b: 160–63.

in Heb 8:2,³³ where the eschatological temple is described as the true tent, pitched by the Lord. This is “the place intended for Adam,”³⁴ now inhabited by Wisdom in Sirach. I will argue below that according to Hebrews it is now inhabited by Jesus the exalted Son of God.³⁵

The Hymn in Praise of the Ancestors (Sir 44–50)

Sirach 44–50 contains a lengthy hymn praising famous individuals from the past.³⁶ It begins with Enoch and Noah, and includes (among others) Moses, who is equal in glory to the “holy ones” (ἅγιοι), and Aaron, a priest with regal qualities. Aaron is given the longest and most detailed treatment and, along with Phinehas and his descendants, has a perpetual priesthood. The list ends with a second reference to Enoch,³⁷ followed by Joseph, Shem and Seth who are described as honoured, and Adam, who is exalted above every living being.³⁸ After referring to the superior glory of Adam, Ben Sira turns to his own near contemporary Simon (50:1–24). When the treatment of the figures from the past texts is re-read in the light of Sir 50, it becomes apparent that they

33 See Church 2008: 145–57 for a development of the argument that Heb 8:2 alludes to Num 24:6.

34 Wright 1991: 25–26. Cf. Hengel 1974: 1: 157.

35 For similar symbolism see 1QH^a XIV 18–21; XVI 5–28; Odes of Solomon 11:1–12:2, 38:16–20, and as I will argue below (Chapter 8) in Heb 8:1–2.

36 In what follows I use the Hebrew text in Beentjes 1997: 78–91 where it can be reconstructed with any degree of certainty. I use Beentjes’ chapter and verse references, with comments on the Greek text in Ziegler 1980: 331–62 where appropriate.

37 Enoch appears in 44:16 and 49:14, although the reference in the Greek text at 44:16 is absent from the Masada fragments and the Syriac version. Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 499 suggest that it may have been added due to Enoch’s “popularity in the last centuries BC as the custodian of ancient lore.” Mack 1985: 199–200, 238 excludes it as inauthentic. Wright 1997: 215–16 considers that whether or not it is authentic, “some mention of Enoch at the head of the Praise of the Ancestors is called for.” It is now clearly visible in line 18 of MS B XIII verso (see online: <http://www.bensira.org/navigator.php?Manuscript=B&PageNum=26>. Accessed 4 August 2016, and http://genizah.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/fragment/MS_HEB_e_62/8b. Accessed 4 August 2016). Marböck 1981: 104 considers that the double mention of Enoch provides a fine inclusio around “die Frommen und Weisen Israels.”

38 Adam is described with the words **על כל חי תפארת אדם** (“the splendour of Adam is above every living being”). Marböck 1981: 108 notes that Enoch and Joseph are “fast unvergleichlich” and Shem, Seth and Enosh honoured, but Adam’s glory is greater than all of them. Mack 1985: 201 is sceptical that this statement about Adam comes from Ben Sira himself, reading 49:16 in the light of 15:14–20; 17:1–14. But these texts refer to humanity in general rather than to Adam. The treatment of Adam in 49:16 differs markedly from the remark about him in 24:28.

serve to prepare the reader to understand the treatment of Simon with whom Israelite history culminates.³⁹

Sirach 50 is the climax of the work, followed only by a prayer of thanks.⁴⁰ In his praise of the ancestors, Ben Sira relies on the Hebrew Scriptures, but his treatment of Simon draws from his own observation as he composes a hymn echoing the creation account of Gen 1.⁴¹ There are also allusions to the praise of Wisdom in Sir 24 and to the treatment of Aaron and Phinehas, as well as to Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah who rebuilt the temple and restored the fallen walls of the city (49:11–13), something that Simon also does.⁴²

The exalted status of Adam described in 49:16 provides a transition to the treatment of Simon, who is described in similar words in 50:1 ותפארת גדול אחיו (“greatest of his brothers and the splendour of his people was Simon, son of Johanan, the priest”).⁴³ The repetition of תפארת (“glory, splendour”) in the descriptions of Adam and Simon make it clear that Simon is associated with Adam in glory.⁴⁴ But this is more than a simple transition.

39 Mack 1985: 37–65; Perdue 1994: 284–86; Kooij 2010: 58–60. Wright 1992: 410 draws favourable comparisons between the place of Simon in the context of Sir 44–50 and of Jesus in Hebrews. For Ben Sira Israel's history has been leading to the great high priest Simon; for the author of Hebrews, Israel's history has been leading to the great high priest Jesus. He goes on to argue that Hebrews subverts the story of Sir 44–50, for it is not Simon in the Jerusalem temple but Jesus the true high priest in the heavenly temple that is central. See also Richardson 2012: 144.

40 An acrostic prayer preserved in 11QPs^a is regularly added as an appendix to Sirach. See Skehan 1971: 387–400.

41 Goshen-Gottstein 2002: 260–64; Mulder 2002: 223; 2003: 52; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 94–112.

42 Marböck 1971: 74–75; 1999: 216–19, 223–24; Hayward 1991: 24–29; 1996: 52–55, 63–72, 83–84; Himmelfarb 2000: 97; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 69–113; Skelton 2009: 9–10. As Skelton notes, Simon's achievements in repairing the temple in Sir 48:17–22, as well as other key characters in the “Praise of the Ancestors” reflect Hezekiah's reform. This attribution of royal attributes to the priesthood is seen in 45:6–22 with respect to Aaron and in 45:23–26 with respect to Simon. It represents Simon as the embodiment of other famous people in the list. Skelton concludes, “the ideal ruler is an Aaronide high priest from the line of Phinehas who keeps Torah, embodied quintessentially in Simeon” (p. 11).

43 The Greek text is briefer, reading only that Σίμων Ονίου υἱὸς ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας (“Simon, son of Onias was the high priest”).

44 For the glory of Adam see 1QS IV 23; 1QH^a IV 27; CD III 20, and the discussions in Charlesworth 1980: 137–45; Levison 1988: *passim*; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 140–45. See also LAE 12–17, where Adam is worshipped (Levison 1988: 177; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 142). תפארת appears in Sir 50:1, 50:20, in an inclusio around the description of Simon's cultic activity. It describes priestly garments in Exod 28:2, 40. Skehan 1979: 374 and Fletcher-Louis 2004: 96–97 propose that תפארת is the Hebrew behind καυχᾶσθαι (“to boast”) in Sir 24:1. Given

The reader is supposed to recognise that Simon the priest represents Adam, the primeval priest in the garden/temple who is created in the image and likeness of God. Moreover, as Fletcher-Louis maintains, “it is Jerusalem, the Temple, its worship and, above all, the priesthood which possesses all the glory of Adam, since in this space and time the original order of creation and the harmony of Eden is recovered.”⁴⁵ The long hymn praising Simon is followed by a benediction and an epilogue in which Ben Sira adds his signature to the book.⁴⁶

Different suggestions have been made as to the structure of Sir 50.⁴⁷ I recognise three sections: Simon’s building activity (50:1–4); Simon’s cosmic priestly characteristics, evident seen as he emerges from the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement (50:5–10); and Simon officiating in the temple during the daily *Tamid* ceremony (50:11–21).⁴⁸

the connections between Sir 24 and Sir 50 this is entirely plausible, although the Greek text downplays this connection. The word δοξάζομαι (“to glorify”) appears in the previous line describing Shem and Seth, but there is no reference to the glory of Adam or Simon in 49:16 and 50:1. It also appears in 50:11 and ααχάζομαι (“to boast”) in 50:20. In 45:8 Aaron is clothed in “perfect splendour” (כליל תפארת), and in 6:31 Wisdom’s crown is also “splendid” (תפארת).

- 45 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 97; Mulder 2003: 55. Hayward 1996: 44–46 connects this text with the creation of Adam in Sir 17:1–8, however that text is better read as referring to the creation of humanity in general (Mulder 2003: 101). In Jub. 3:26–27 Adam offers a sacrifice on the day that he puts on the garments made for him by God. There is a widespread rabbinic tradition that these are Aaron’s priestly garments. See Ginzberg 1913–1967: 1: 332–33; 5: 283 (note 89); Hayward 1989: 16–18. See ‘Ag. Ber. 43; Num. Rab. 4:8; Tanh. b. Toledoth 6.12; Frag. Tg. Gen 48:22; Targ Ps.-J. Gen 27:15; Gen. Rab. 20:12; 97:6. In y. Meg. 1:11 “the best garments” placed on Jacob in Gen 27:15 are priestly garments since he would serve as high priest.
- 46 In the benediction “everyone endorses the appeal to praise Simon. Everything God does for his people Israel through Simon serves to confirm now what He once did and promised forever to do in the covenant with Phinehas,” resulting in peace among the people (Mulder 2003: 55).
- 47 Mulder (2002: 223; 2003: 59) analyses the chapter into five sections, while Fletcher-Louis 2004: 95–96 analyses it according to the days of creation from Gen 1:1–2:3.
- 48 Considerable debate surrounds whether Sir 50:5 refers to Day of Atonement ceremony. The Hebrew text reads מה נהדר בהשגיו מאלו ובצאתו מבית הפרכת, which can be translated “how honourable he was as he gazed out of the tent, as he emerged from within the curtain.” The Greek text reads ὡς ἐδοξάζετο ἐν περιστροφῇ ναοῦ, ἐν ἐξόδῳ οἴκου καταπετάσματος (NRSV: “[h]ow glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of the house of the curtain”). The major differences between the Hebrew text and the Greek translation are the word περιστροφῇ (turning around, a word used for the courses of the stars in Sophocles, *Fragments* 432.8, see *LSJ* 1389; Lloyd-Jones 1996: 222–23; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 104, note 102), the substitution of λαοῦ for ναοῦ by the NRSV and the literal translation of מבית הפרכת with οἴκου καταπετάσματος. Traditionally מבית הפרכת

Simon's Building Activity (50:1–4)

Like Hezekiah, Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah, Simon worked on the temple and the city walls and, like Hezekiah, dug out a cistern. Hayward finds it “striking” that “before all else” Ben Sira praises Simon for this work. It indicates on one level that Ben Sira is concerned that the sacred space of the temple is fit for worship. On another level, however, this sacred space stands for something more significant, for these verses contain several allusions to the first two days of creation in Gen 1.⁴⁹ Verse 1cd–2 introduce his renovations and refer to his work strengthening the walls, v. 3 refers to a water cistern and v. 4 to his work fortifying the city.

has been read as a reference to the holy of holies, from where Simon emerges on the Day of Atonement (Box and Oesterley 1913: 508; Smend 1906: 477, 481; Snaith 1974: 251–52; Collins 1997b: 90; Gurtner 2005a: 190–99. Fearghail 1978: 301 lists commentators from 1859 to 1977 who hold to this view). On this understanding, Sir 50:5 refers to Simon surveying the temple as he emerges from the holy of holies on that day. Fearghail *ibid.*: 301–18 vigorously challenged this view, and it has now been largely abandoned. He compares Sir 50:5–21 with m. Tamid 6.3–7.3 and concludes that the description of the ritual in Sir 50:11–21 accords with the Mishnaic regulations for that ceremony (pp. 302–6). He argues (pp. 306–13) that while the expression *מִבֵּית הַפְּרִכָּת* in Ben Sira's Hebrew text may refer to the holy of holies, the sequence of events outlined in 50:5–21 require the veil to be the outer veil rather than the inner veil, and that the expression refers to the entire temple, described as “the house of the veil.” Fearghail's arguments have now been challenged by Gurtner 2005a: 187–200. While Gurtner does not consider which ceremony is described in vv. 11–21, he does deal with Fearghail's objections to reading the expression *מִבֵּית הַפְּרִכָּת* as “within the curtain,” and argues that Sir 50:5 does refer to the Day of Atonement ceremony. Gurtner notes that in Exod 26:33; Lev 16:2, 12, 15 the Hebrew expression *לְפָנֵי הַפְּרִכָּת* is consistently translated by the LXX as ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (“within the curtain,” see also Heb 6:19), and by the NRSV as “inside the curtain,” (p. 194) as also 4Q266 5 II 7. HALOT 124 gives the sense of “within” for this word, a sense found in Gen 6:14; Exod 25:11; 37:2; Lev 14:41; Num 18:7; 1 Kings 6:15–16; 7:8, 9, 31; 2 Kings 6:30; Ezek 7:15; Sir 4:15; 1QS II 23; 4Q405 15 II–16 6. The word *פְּרִכָּת* is consistently used in the MT to refer to the inner veil of the temple, separating the holy of holies from the holy place (Exod 26:31, 33, 35; 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 36:35; 38:27; 39:34; 40:3, 21, 22, 26; Lev 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 21:23; 24:3; Num 4:5; 18:7; 2 Chr 3:14). The Syriac of Sir 50:5 reads *ܒܝܬܗ ܕܥܝܢܐ* (“beneath the veil,” Vattioni 1968: 271). Instone-Brewer 2011: 306–8 argues that the gold in Sir 50:9 is an allusion to the golden garments in m. Yoma 7.3 and indicates that the Day of Atonement ceremony is in view in Sir. 50. I conclude from these data that Sir 50:5–21 describes two events. Verses 5–10 describe Simon emerging from the holy of holies at the conclusion of the Day of Atonement ritual, and vv. 11–21 describe him officiating at the daily *Tamid* ceremony.

49 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 95.

Sirach 50:1, which appears to be a heading for the entire chapter, reports that Simon “patched up” (ὑπορράπτω)⁵⁰ the “house” (οἶκος, הַבַּיִת) and “strengthened” (στερεόω) the “temple” (ναός, הַיְכָל).⁵¹ In v. 2 he lays foundations of the “height of the court” (ὑψος αὐλῆς)⁵² and the “high walls of the temple enclosure” (ἀνάλημμα ὑψηλὸν περιβόλου ἱεροῦ). References to what is below and what is above (the foundations and the upper extremities), and the verb στερεόω, are reminiscent of the second day of creation, reflecting the notion that the temple functions as the cosmic mountain that “covers the expanse between the upper and lower realms.”⁵³

Sirach 50:3 refers to a “water-pool” or “reservoir” (ΜΚΩΗ, ἀποδοχεῖον ὑδάτων) dug out in Simon’s time as a “pit” (חֶשֶׁן, λάκκος) with its circumference “like the sea” (ὥσει θαλάσσης).⁵⁴ On the third day of creation God gathered (ΚΩΗ)

50 Ὑπορράπτω is a *hapax legomenon* here in the LXX and does not appear in the NT. In Josephus *Ant.* 17.136 it refers to a patch in a garment. Fletcher-Louis (ibid.: 98–99) suggests that it has the sense of “undergird,” referring to *LSJ* 1893. However, while *LSJ* refers to repairing the soles of shoes and “a mend in the bottom,” the notion of “underneath” is more in the words for shoes (ὑποδήματα) and bottom (πυθμένα) than in the verb. The Hebrew verb that ὑπορράπτω translates is פָּקַד, which has a wide semantic range, although apparently not including the idea of undergirding (*HALOT* 955–58; Jastrow 1989: 1206–7). The Niphal as here appears in Neh 7:1; 12:44 to refer to persons appointed to an official duty. Mulder 2003: 105 translates פָּקַד with “inspect.” Hayward 1996: 41 renders the Hebrew with “visited” and the Greek with “patched-up” (ibid.: 73).

51 In the Hebrew text בַּיִת (“house”) is definite and הַיְכָל (“temple”) indefinite. In the Greek text both οἶκος (“house”) and ναός (“temple”) are indefinite.

52 This is the reading in the Göttingen LXX (Ziegler 1980: 357). Rahlfs 1935: 2: 466 reads (ὑψος διπλῆς, “the height of the double”). Fletcher-Louis 2004: 95 follows Rahlfs and translates “the height of the double (waters?),” adding the reference to water (with no MS evidence), suggesting that the temple is like the firmament that separated the waters above and below. The reading ὑψος αὐλῆς was suggested by Smend 1906: 480 (again with no MS evidence) to resolve what he considered “meaningless” Greek. Hayward 1996: 75 follows the reading of the Göttingen LXX (“the height of the court”), and in a textual note on p. 75 suggests “double walls.” The Greek text of Sir 50:2–3 inverts the Hebrew text of lines 9–10 of MS XIX recto. I use the Greek versification. The Hebrew text (MS B XIX recto line 10) reads קִיר נִבְנָה בְּיָמָיו (“in whose days a wall was built”).

53 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 97–101, quotation from p. 97. The text echoes Sir 24:5 where Wisdom encircles the vault of heaven and walks in the depths of the abyss (γύρον οὐρανοῦ ἐκύκλωσα μόνη καὶ ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιπάτησα).

54 Mulder 2003: 102 translates “on account of the waterflow.” The Hebrew text reads בַּם (Beentjes 1997: 88), normally emended to בִּים or כִּים (“in” or “like” the sea, Box and Oesterley 1913: 507; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 549; Wright 1989: 305; Hayward 1996: 44; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 101). This may have been the way Ben Sira’s grandson read the text, given his translation ὥσει θαλάσσης. Mulder 2003: 110–14 argues that the Hebrew text

the sea into one place and let the dry land appear, a text echoed here.⁵⁵ These allusions to the creation story reflect an understanding of the cosmic significance of the temple and picture the Jerusalem temple as a microcosm of the universe.

Simon's Cosmic Priestly Characteristics (50:5–10)

Sirach 50:5 refers to Simon emerging from the holy of holies after the Day of Atonement ceremony.⁵⁶ Verses 6–10 describe the emerging Simon with cosmic symbolism. He is “like a star of light among the clouds” (כְּכּוֹכַב אוֹר מִבֵּין עָבִים),⁵⁷ “like the full moon” (כִּירַח מָלֵא), “like the shining sun” (כְּשֶׁמֶשׁ מְשַׁרְכֵת), and “like a rainbow in the clouds” (כְּקֶשֶׁת נִרְאָתָה בְּעָנָן). The symbolism reflects the hymn celebrating the works of God in creation (42:15–43:33)⁵⁸ that probably serves as an extended introduction to the hymn praising the ancestors.⁵⁹ That hymn refers to “the emerging sun” (שֶׁמֶשׁ מוֹפִיעַ בְּצֵאתוֹ),⁶⁰ reflecting the glory of God (43:1–5); the “moon governing the changing seasons” (יֶרֶחַ יֹרֵחַ עֲתוֹת) and giving information about sacred seasons; the “glory of the stars” (הַדֵּר כּוֹכָב) standing in their places (43:6–10); and the “rainbow” (קֶשֶׁת), which the readers are invited to behold and then “bless its maker” (43:11–12). Allusions to Gen 1, Ps 19 and Ezek 1:28 have been noted.⁶¹ These heavenly creatures reflect God's glory and move at his command. This is the context for the description of Simon in similar terms. Simon embodies them all, reflecting these, the greatest of God's works.⁶²

Fletcher-Louis locates the source of this imagery in the creation of the sun, moon and stars on the fourth day of creation in Gen 1. He compares Simon emerging from within the veil to the emergence of the sun on its course

should stand, and that the reference is to the Pool of Bethesda, described as a “reservoir with a wall in it” (מְקוֹה אֲשִׁיחַ בֶּסֶם). However, this involves reading אֲשִׁיחַ (“wall,” a *hapax legomenon* in Jer 50:15) rather than אֲשִׁיחַ (“pit”). This latter word does not appear in BHS, but refers to a cistern four times in the Copper Scroll (3Q15 v 6; VII 4; X 5; XI 12).

55 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 100–103.

56 See footnote 48 (above).

57 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 552, and Mulder 2003: 126 identify Ps 148:3 as the source of this symbolism.

58 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 484–87.

59 Mack 1985: 13–15; Wright 1997: 206.

60 This reading is from the Masada MS col. v, line 18. MS B XI verso, line 2 reads שֶׁמֶשׁ מְבִיעַ בְּצֵרָתוֹ (“the sun proclaims in its distress” [?]), with the Masada reading in the margin. יֶבִיעַ echoes יֶבִיעַ (“pours forth”) in Ps 19:3 (MT). For the emerging sun see 1 En. 72:2–37.

61 Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 492–93.

62 Skelton 2009: 9–10.

through the firmament (Ps 19:1),⁶³ and to Ezek 1:26–28 where the glory of God enthroned in heaven is “like a rainbow appearing in the cloud on a rainy day” (כמראה הקשת אשר יהיה בענן ביום הגשם).⁶⁴ Thus, Simon embodies the glory of God and the text signifies the cosmic significance of the temple.⁶⁵ As the sun and the stars move across the heavens, so Simon moves through the temple.

Simon Officiating in the Temple (50:11–21)

This section describes Simon officiating at the daily *Tamid* sacrifice.⁶⁶ Verses 11–13 echo the sixth day of creation in Gen 1:26–30, interpreted through Ps 8:3–7.⁶⁷ In Gen 1, Adam is created in God’s image and given dominion over all creation. Psalm 8:5–8 celebrates this in terms of the “glory and honour” (כבוד והדר) with which God has crowned humanity.⁶⁸ In Sir 50:11 Simon, wrapped in “glory” (כבוד) and clothed in “splendour” (תפארת), brings “honour” (הדר) to the sanctuary.⁶⁹ The other priests are also there in “their glory” (בכבודם).⁷⁰ This is

-
- 63 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 103–4. Fletcher-Louis refers to the LXX of Exod 30:24 (the fourth speech to Moses in the P account of the construction of the wilderness tabernacle), where the Hebrew word קדה (“cassia”) is rendered with ῥίς (“rainbow,” see BDAG 480). ῥίς is a *hapax legomenon* here in the LXX, but the word also appears in Rev 4:3; 10:1. This presumed intertextual echo is a bit too faint to be clearly heard. The Greek text of Sir 50:8 reads τὸ ξόν φωτίζον (“a shining bow”) and is better read as an allusion to Ezek 1:28.
- 64 Box and Oesterley 1913: 508; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 552; Himmelfarb 1993: 19; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 74.
- 65 Compare Weinfeld 1981: 506–7, “the high priest is depicted as the morning star, and as the sun shining on the temple.”
- 66 Fearghail 1978: 302–5; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 532–33; Hayward 1996: 55–61, 80–81; 2007: 389–93; Instone-Brewer 2011: 306–8. Mulder 2002: 225–28 reads vv. 16–19 with reference to *Rosh Hashshana*. That this is a new section is shown by the initial reference to Simon dressing himself in glorious robes, in the repetition of תפארת (splendour, see 49:16; 50:1), and in the description of the beginning of the ritual as he ascends to the altar. The movement here is towards the centre, while in v. 5 it is away from the centre. See also Fletcher-Louis 2004: 105–6, who identifies echoes in this text of the description of Aaron officiating in the sanctuary in Sir 45:7–8.
- 67 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 105–7.
- 68 Another echo of Ps 8 in the immediate context is the reference to Enoch in Sir 49:16, said to have been honoured along with Seth and Shem (ושם ושת ואנוש נפקדו). Both אנוש and נפקד appear in Ps 8:5.
- 69 Compare Ps 96:6 ותפארת במקדשו לפניו הוד והדר (“honour and glory are before him strength and splendour in his sanctuary”).
- 70 The words δόξα (“glory”), δοξάζω (“glorify”), στέφανος (“crown”) all appear in the Greek text of Sir 50:11–13.

not just humanity in general, however. Here, Simon officiating in the temple is portrayed as Adam ruling over all things in the garden.⁷¹

Fletcher-Louis hears echoes of God's rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2:1–4) in Sir 50:14–21.⁷² There is an *inclusio* around vv. 14–19, with the Hebrew verb כלה (“finished,” vv. 14, 19), the Greek noun συντέλεια (“completion,” v. 14), and the verb συντελέω (“bring to completion,” v. 19). Moreover, the Greek expression in v. 19 is ἕως συντελεσθῇ κόσμος κυρίου (“until he completed the κόσμος of the Lord”).⁷³ In Gen 2:1–2 God “finishes” (בלה, LXX συντελέω) the work of creation.⁷⁴ Then, just as God “blesses” (εὐλογέω ברך, Gen 2:3) the seventh day, so Simon “blesses” (δοῦναι εὐλογίαν, בך Sir 50:20–21) the assembled worshippers. While the blessing is for “all the congregation of the people of Israel” (קהל ישראל, כל, πᾶσα ἐκκλησία υἱῶν Ισραηλ), in the Hebrew text of v. 17 these are identified as “all flesh” (כל בשר) and in v. 19 as “all the people of the earth” (כל עם הארץ). The whole creation is in view.

Conclusion

In Sirach there is no suggestion of a heavenly temple above corresponding to the earthly temple below. Rather, the Jerusalem temple is viewed as a microcosm of the universe and the link between heaven and earth, so that to be in the temple is to be in the presence of God in heaven, as was the first man Adam in the Eden sanctuary. Ben Sira anticipates no eschatological temple to replace the present temple in the future. Simon, the current high priest, is the representative of God before humanity. He appears with cosmic characteristics and his movements in the temple echo the movements of the sun and the stars through the heavens. This is an entirely positive portrayal of the temple, with everything functioning as it should.

71 The terms rendered “humanity” in Ps 8, אנוש and בן אדם, can be read with reference to Adam, the first man, ruling over all things in the garden. See Borsch 1967: 114; Fletcher-Louis 2004: 107.

72 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 107–11.

73 I leave κόσμος untranslated to emphasise the connotations of creation that would not be lost on Greek speaking readers of Sirach. The Hebrew text reads לשרת מזבח (“the service of the altar”), and NRSV renders κόσμος κυρίου with “order of worship.” This is appropriate; given the word for “arranging” the offerings in v. 14 is κοσμέω.

74 Fletcher-Louis 2004: 108 demonstrates the linguistic correspondences between the completion of the creation in Gen 2:1–3 and the completion of the sanctuary in Exod 31:18; 39:32; 39:43.

The Letter of Aristeas

The Letter of Aristeas (hereinafter *Let. Aris.*)⁷⁵ is mainly known because of the legend it contains of the origins of the Septuagint,⁷⁶ and while this legend frames the entire work, it takes up only a small proportion.⁷⁷ The remainder, and the real intention of the work, seems to be to defend Jewish culture and law, and Judaism “in the light of its law as available in the Greek version,”⁷⁸ and to demonstrate the skill and wisdom of the translators and the translation they produced.⁷⁹ It seems to be addressed to Jew and Gentile alike.⁸⁰

Aside from the detail surrounding the translation,⁸¹ four other matters appear: a description of gifts sent by Ptolemy to the Jerusalem temple (51–83), a travelogue describing Palestine, including Jerusalem, the temple and the garments of the high priest (83–120), Eleazar’s apology for the law (128–171), and a description of a series of symposia held for the translators where they demonstrate their superior wisdom and skill (187–300). My concern is with the details of the gifts and with the travelogue, which presents Jerusalem and the temple in a positive light.

The author calls himself Aristeas, and writes as an influential member of the court of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–247 BCE), however, the work seems

75 I refer to the document as “*Let. Aris.*” and the implied author/narrator as “Aristeas.” This is clearly a pseudonym. See my discussion of authorship below.

76 The legend only discusses the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek, rather than the entire LXX. However, it is customary to use the term Septuagint in discussions of *Let. Aris.* See Wright 2015: 6 (note 8).

77 For detail on the contents see (e.g.) Hadas 1951: 1–2; Nickelsburg 1984b: 76–77; 2005: 196–98; Shutt 1985: 7–8; Helyer 2002: 278–79. Wright 2015: 30–35 discusses text-critical issues. There are twenty-three extant Greek MSS dating from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries, a long paraphrase in Josephus, *Ant.* 12.11–118, and Eusebius includes some excerpts in *Praep. ev.* 8.2–5, 9; 9.38. In what follows I use the Greek text of Thackeray 1914: 531–606, as reproduced in Hadas 1951: 92–227. Unless otherwise noted, English translations are my own.

78 Shutt 1985: 9. See Murray 1987: 17; Jellicoe 1989 [1968]: 47; Helyer 2002: 279–80.

79 On this see Meecham 1932: 117–19; Tcherikover 1958: 79–80; Wasserstein and Wasserstein 2006: 24–25; Wright 2008: 277–84; 2011: 307–10; 2015: 62–74.

80 See Barclay 1996: 138–50. Hacham 2005: 2 refers to “a combination of total loyalty to Judaism and deep and active involvement with the Hellenistic world and culture.”

81 Paragraphs 9–82 deal with the request for a translation of the Jewish law and the release of certain slaves held in Egypt, 120–129 deal with the selection of the translators and 301–311 describe the actual translation work. Wendland 1900: 1–84 divided the text into numbered paragraphs.

to be dated later than this,⁸² and is no doubt fictional. The author seems to have been Jewish, since he seems thoroughly acquainted with the temple and temple worship, cites Scripture from the Septuagint and speaks highly of God, clearly the Jewish God. Nevertheless, he writes as a Gentile (para. 16).⁸³ The place of writing seems to have been Alexandria, given his knowledge of that city and of the details of life there under Ptolemy.⁸⁴

It is addressed to the author's brother, Philocrates,⁸⁵ hence the usual designation "letter," although the precise genre is debated. The author uses the term "prose narrative" (διήγησις, para. 1, 8, 322), and on this basis Honigman argues that it is best described as "a kind of historical monograph."⁸⁶ Nonetheless, as Rappaport notes, it "hardly contains any authentic historical information."⁸⁷ What it does give us, however, is insight into the Jewish community in Alexandria and the relationships between this community and the rest of the populace around the time that it was written.⁸⁸

The date is also debated. The earliest date would be around the time of the events it purports to relate in the middle of the second century BCE, and since

82 In paras. 28, 182 he lets slip that he belonged to a later time, although in para. 28 the imperfect διωκεῖτο ("used to administer") is textually uncertain. See Hadas 1951: 109, 170–71; Murray 1987: 15; Gruen 2013: 2722, 2745; Wright 2015: 142, 145, 320 (where he questions this reading of para. 182).

83 Goodman 1986: 677; Wright 2015: 16–17.

84 Let. Aris. 301. For the provenance see Shutt 1985: 9; Nickelsburg 2005: 198; Davila 2005b: 122–25; Wright 2015: 16–20.

85 See paras. 1, 322.

86 Honigman 2003: 29–35 (quote from p. 30). Nickelsburg 1984b: 78 refers to it as "a written speech." White 2015: 193–207 argues that it was intended to be read as a letter, describing it as "a 'historical narrative' . . . conveyed as privileged, personal communication in epistolary form . . . perhaps . . . an epistolary novella" (p. 206). See also Collins 2000a: 97, who describes Let. Aris. as a "*plasma*, . . . 'an imaginative treatment of history,'" as also Hadas 1951: 56–59. Doering 2012: 218–19 proposes that, in para. 1 the term διήγησις refers not to Let. Aris., but to some other work, but, while acknowledging the syntactic complexity, Wright 2015: 104–5 argues that it more likely refers to what Aristeeas has composed. In paras. 8 and 322 it also is more likely that διήγησις refers to Let. Aris., although even there it is unclear. Wright (ibid.: 43–51) notes "a conscious blending/bending of genres that evokes both historiography and epistolography in order to exploit the advantages that they confer for the communicative goals that Ps.-Aristeeas intends for his own text." Rajak 2009: 31–32 argues that the designation "letter" is quite appropriate.

87 Rappaport 2012: 286.

88 Tcherikover 1958: 84–95; Rappaport 2012: 286–87.

Philo's account of the translation of the LXX seems to depend on Let. Aris.,⁸⁹ it cannot be later than the middle of the first century CE. Honigman proposes 246–205 BCE during the times of Ptolemy III or Ptolemy IV as the earliest date, and notes almost anywhere between this and Josephus as a possibility.⁹⁰ Many scholars assign a date sometime in the second half of the second century BCE.⁹¹ From my perspective, more pertinent than the date of composition is that it was known and used by both Philo and Josephus, and was therefore part of the discursive space of first century Judaism in both Rome and Alexandria, and in that case, relevant for the understanding of Hebrews.⁹²

The temple has a prominent place in Let. Aris. Paragraphs 33–83 describe gifts for the temple that accompanied the delegation to Eleazar, and the temple occupies pride of place in the travelogue (83–120), in that, while Aristes announces that he will describe the whole country, almost the entire first half of that description (83–99) is devoted to the temple and its cultus. Noting this, Hadas suggests that the story is modelled, “perhaps unconsciously” on the return from exile in Ezra–Nehemiah,⁹³ and Murray adds to this that “the narrative technique is modelled on the story of the restoration of the Temple.”⁹⁴

The Gifts Accompanying the Delegation (33–83)

Immediately following the introduction (paras. 1–8) Aristes refers to the library project (9–11) and the release of Jewish slaves held in Egypt (12–27).

89 Philo, *Mos.* 2.25–41. On this see Hadas 1951: 21–26; Honigman 2003: 11, Wasserstein and Wasserstein 2006: 35–45 and White 2015: 187, who refers to Andrews 1913: 91. Jellicoe 1964: 144 suggests that Aristes and Philo may have drawn upon a common tradition. Josephus, *Ant.* 12.11–118 also depends on Let. Aris., mentioning it by name. On this see Hadas 1951: 18–21; Wasserstein and Wasserstein 2006: 45–50; Wright 2015: 33–34.

90 Honigman 2003: 2.

91 Hadas 1951: 3–54; Nickelsburg 1984b: 77; 2005: 198. Shutt 1985: 8–9 assigns a somewhat earlier date, around 170 BCE, following Goodman 1986: 679–81 and Jellicoe 1989 [1968]: 47–50. Wasserstein and Wasserstein 2006: 20 suggest a date around 200 BCE, and Rappaport 2012: 285–303 earlier still in the latter years of the third century BCE. The most influential discussion is found in Bickerman 2007: 108–33. More recent discussions are in Rappaport 2012: 285–303; White 2015: 183–90; Wright 2015: 21–30.

92 I am not suggesting that the author of Hebrews made use of, or even knew Aristes; rather, the contents of Aristes were ideas in the air around the time Hebrews was written. Jellicoe 1961: 149–55 argues that Luke's writings reflect the atmosphere of Let. Aris., as does Murray 1987: 25.

93 Hadas 1951: 38–40.

94 Murray 1987: 20.

He inserts a report from Demetrius the librarian to Ptolemy (28–34a) and correspondence between Ptolemy and Eleazar (34b–51a). Ptolemy’s response to the report from Demetrius mentions certain gifts for the temple that he will send to accompany the delegation (33) as well as “offerings of first fruits for the temple” (ἀπαρχάς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν) and silver for the sacrifices (40). These gifts contributed to the “repair” (ἐπισκευή) of the temple (42).⁹⁵ The gifts demonstrated Ptolemy’s “piety” (εὐσέβεια) towards the Jewish God (42).

These gifts are the first indication of the importance of the temple. They are described as offerings of “firstfruits” (ἀπαρχή), a term that appears frequently in the LXX, referring to the choicest part of a person’s flocks or produce that belonged to YHWH and was dedicated to YHWH.⁹⁶ More significantly, in the context of the repair of the temple, the Israelites brought such offerings for the construction of the tabernacle,⁹⁷ and, in addition, items brought back from the exile for rebuilding the temple are also described with this term (Ezra 8:25–30). The discussion of the refurbishment of the temple with these gifts from Ptolemy sits alongside the construction of the tabernacle and the second temple and in Let. Aris. has similar importance. Like Ben Sira who describes Simon’s building activity in Sir 50:1–4, Aristeas takes pains to ensure that Ptolemy, the gentile ruler, contributes to making the sacred space of the temple fit for worship. Moreover, these gifts come from a gentile king, something reminiscent of such texts as Hag 2:6–9; Zech 14:14 where the wealth of the nations was expected to come to restore and beautify the temple.⁹⁸

The gifts, or “furnishings” (κατασκευάσματα) are described in paras. 51b–82,⁹⁹ beginning with the “table” (τράπεζα), which takes an inordinate amount of

95 For the translation “repair” see *LSJ* 656; Wright 2015: 165. Shutt 1985: 15 translates with “furnishing” which gives a quite different nuance.

96 For offerings consisting of “firstfruits” see Exod 22:28; 23:19; 25:2; 35:5; 36:6; 39:1; Lev 2:12; 22:12; 23:10; Num 5:9; 15:20, 21; 18:8, 11, 12, 29, 30, 32; 31:29; Deut 12:6, 11, 17; 18:4; 26:2, 10; 1 Kgdms 2:29; 2 Chr 31:5, 10, 12, 14; 2 Esd 8:25; 20:38, 40; 22:44; 23:5; Ezek 20:31, 40; 44:30; 45:16; Tob 1:6; Sir 7:3; 35:7; 45:10.

97 Exod 25:2, 3; 35:5; 36:6; 39:1. Hacham 2005: 11–12 notes “linguistic parallels” between the descriptions of the table in Let. Aris. 57 and the LXX account of the construction of the table in the tabernacle, as does Collins 2000a: 103. Collins’s point is that the text echoes the LXX rather than any Hebrew text, and this is valid. I note that the linguistic parallels also extend to the brief summary of the gifts in paras. 40, 42.

98 Barclay 1996: 143 notes that Eleazar does not reciprocate with gifts for an Egyptian temple.

99 For the significance of the furnishings in the temple see Barton 2015: 357; Anderson 2008: 13–33; 2009: 161–94.

space (53–72),¹⁰⁰ followed by the “mixing bowls” (κρατήρ) in paras. 73–77.¹⁰¹ Paragraph 78 describes the effect on the observers, and para. 79 describes the “drinking bowls” (φιάλη).¹⁰² Paragraphs 80–83 describe the magnificence of the gifts, and Ptolemy’s efforts in ensuring that they were of the highest quality.

While the description of the table in paras. 57–58 contains reminiscences of Exod 25:23–30 in terms of its size, it goes far beyond this.¹⁰³ Indeed Ptolemy wanted to make a table five times larger but did not do so, since this could make it unsuitable for the worship of God (52–53), which was his real concern (54)—he did not want it “merely deposited in the place” (τὸ κεῖσθαι μόνον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ).¹⁰⁴ Consequently, he made up for the lack of size by increasing the weight, so that the finished product was “inimitable in its workmanship and outstanding in its beauty” (ταῖς τέχναις ἀμίμητα, καὶ τῇ καλλονῇ διαπρεπεῖ, 72).¹⁰⁵ The point then is, not so much to describe the table in terms of the biblical

100 Wright 2015: 180 gives details of the four tables referred to in connection with tabernacle and temple in the OT. See Exod 25:23–30 (LXX 22–29); 37:10–16 (LXX 38:9–11); 1 Kings 7:48 (LXX 3 Kgdms 7:34); 1 Macc 1:22; 4:41–51.

101 This word appears three times in Exod 25:31–34 in a description of the detail of the lamp stand. In Exod 24:6 it describes the basin in which Moses placed the blood that he dashed against the altar. It also appears in Prov 9:2–3 as a mixing bowl, and metaphorically, describing a woman’s navel, in Song 7:3.

102 For the distinction between these two types of bowl, see Wright 2015: 191. NRSV translates this word with “basins” in Exod 27:3; 38:23; Num 4:14. The word appears fourteen times in Num 7 (vv. 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 84, 85) describing basins presented by the leaders of Israel for the dedication of the altar. In 3 Kgdms 7:26, 31, 36 Hiram provides these for Solomon’s temple, see also 1 Chr 28:17; 2 Chr 4:8, 21; Jer 52:18; in 4 Kgdms 25:14–15 they are removed from the temple and taken to Babylon; in 1 Esd 2:10 they are restored to Jerusalem by Cyrus, and in Neh 7:70 (2 Esd 17:70) they are included in the gifts for the second temple from the heads of the ancestral houses. In 1 Macc 1:22 Antiochus removes them along with the table and other furnishings from the second temple; and in Zech 14:20 they appear in the restored temple that has been enriched by the wealth of the nations, and inscribed “holy to YHWH”. The word appears in non-cultic senses in Prov 23:31; Song 5:18; 6:2; Zech 9:15.

103 The description is also so convoluted that the table is impossible to reconstruct. See Hadas 1951: 121; Murray 1975: 124 (citing Pelletier 1962: 132, note 1) and Wright 2015: 185–86.

104 The “place” (τόπος) is a frequent appellation for the temple, see Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23–24; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 17:8, 10; 18:6; 31:11; Ps 25:8 (LXX); 131:5 (LXX); 1 Chr 16:27; 2 Chr 6:32, 40; Sir 36:12; 3 Macc 2:9, 10, 14, and numerous other texts. See further footnote 24 to chapter 3 (below).

105 In Exod 25:23–24 (MT) Moses is to make a table of acacia wood and “overlay the table with pure gold” (וַיַּצְפֵּית אֹתוֹ זָהָב טָהוֹר) while in the LXX (Exod 25:23) the table itself is solid gold (Καὶ ποιήσεις τράπεζαν χρυσοῦ καθαροῦ). Let. Aris. reflects this detail from the LXX, with considerably more decoration. See Murray 1975: 124.

text, but to demonstrate Ptolemy's generosity, with the table as a symbol of the wealth of the gentile king lavished upon the temple, and by extension, upon the Jewish God.¹⁰⁶

The Travelogue (83–120)

Paragraphs 83–120 take the form of a travelogue, giving details of the geography of Judea, Jerusalem,¹⁰⁷ the temple and the garments of the high priest. The journey to Jerusalem seems to have been a major concern of Aristéas, since he refers to it in his opening paragraph.¹⁰⁸ He begins by noting that he has composed a trustworthy narrative,¹⁰⁹ of his “conversation” (έντυχία) with Eleazar the high priest of Jerusalem for Philocrates who wants to know about “the details and purpose of . . . [the] deputation (para. 1)”¹¹⁰ Admittedly, the end of para. 3 refers to translation of the divine law, but Philocrates is interested in “divine things” (τὰ θεῖα), which is more than the translation of the LXX, and surely also includes land, city and temple. As Tcherikova notes, referring to the description of Jerusalem, temple, high priest and religious service, perhaps with a degree of overstatement, “[h]ere is the center of his interest and for it the whole account was written.”¹¹¹

The Temple (84–87)

Central, however, and given pride of place in paras. 84–87, is the temple which appears first, even though Aristéas says that he will “first explain the setting of the entire country” (ἡ θέσις τῆς ὅλης χώρας πρῶτον δηλώσω, 83). The temple is clearly to be understood as its most significant feature, something that the description bears out. The city (Jerusalem) is in the middle of the country, “upon a mountain that reached to a great height” (ἐπ’ ὄρους ὑψηλὴν ἔχοντος τὴν ἀνάτασιν, 83), on the “summit” (κορυφή) of which was the temple built with

106 Wright 2015: 185–87. Gruen 2013: 2727 suggests that in this description Aristéas is mocking Ptolemy's pretentiousness.

107 While the city described is no doubt Jerusalem, it is not so named in Let. Aris.

108 Barbu 2014: 6 proposes that Let. Aris. “is the purported account of a Greek courtier traveling to Judea on behalf of the Egyptian king Ptolemy Philadelphus, and escorting back to Alexandria a cohort of Jewish sages entrusted with the Greek translation of the Jewish Law.”

109 For this reading of para. 1, see Wright 2015: 104–5.

110 This translation from *ibid.*: 99.

111 Tcherikover 1958: 78. Cf. also Hacham 2005: 2: “Therefore, *Aristéas* should not be viewed only as a historical description of the translation of the Torah into Greek but rather as a narrative recounting the expedition and its outcomes.”

“great splendour” (ἐκπρεπῶς).¹¹² Texts such as Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1–2 envisage the eschatological city/temple on a high mountain, but in Let. Aris. this is not the eschatological temple, but the existing temple, radiating with splendour.¹¹³

This raises the question whether this is an eyewitness account, something that recent scholarship has argued to be unlikely.¹¹⁴ Rather, Aristeas sets out to describe an ideal city in the centre of a country and an ideal temple in the centre of the city, based not on an actual visit to Jerusalem, but on ancient literary sources describing such, which he has creatively rewritten to suit his purposes.¹¹⁵ As Honigman argues, Aristeas has no intention of providing an eyewitness account, but has modelled his description of Judea and Jerusalem on Aristotle, *Politics*, 7.11, creatively dealing with his sources to show Judea and Jerusalem as a theocracy, with the temple its most conspicuous feature.¹¹⁶ Thus he presents the temple in a most positive light as the central symbol of the Judaism he is commending to his readers.

In describing the temple, Aristeas refers to the three, seventy cubit surrounding walls (περίβολοι),¹¹⁷ the doorway (θύρωμα), the veil (καταπέτασμα) and the altar (θυσιαστήριον). His descriptions concentrate on the magnificence of these features, and give the impression that no expense had been spared in its construction. He also comments on the mesmerising spectacle of the veil moving in the wind and the appropriate design of the altar and the ladder the priests had to climb in their ankle length fine linen robes, thus enabled to maintain proper decorum (see Exod 20:26). The temple is magnificent, and as

112 On the importance of the capital city being in the centre of the country see Plato, *Laws*, 745B. See the discussion in Wright 2015: 196. See also Pseudo-Hecataeus as preserved in Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.198 for the temple in the centre of the city.

113 See also Pss 48:1–2; 78:69.

114 Wright 2011: 304–5. Bickerman 2007: 126 is more optimistic about the portrait of Judea and Jerusalem. He is critical of the description of the temple, since it describes parts of it that he would not have been permitted to inspect (pp. 114–15). See now Honigman 2004: 73–77 who argues that the question has no bearing on the realism of the description. She argues that it is unlikely that the narrator (Aristeas) had been to Jerusalem but that he had probably learned some of the details from earlier travellers.

115 For creative rewriting in Let. Aris, see Murray 1975: 123–28, and for Aristeas's use of Aristotle, *Politics*, 7.11 in the description of the ideal city in these chapters see Honigman 2003: 23–25; 2004: 73–101; Wright 2015: 194–96; Barbu 2014: 8–9.

116 Honigman 2004: 77–78; Wright 2015: 195–96. For this part of Let. Aris. Honigman 2004: 75–76 also identifies allusions to Pseudo-Hecataeus as preserved in Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.195–199.

117 The identification of these walls is debated, see Wright 2015: 197–98. Hayward 1996: 30 translates περίβολοι with “enclosed precincts.”

in ben Sira's account everything is as it should be.¹¹⁸ It is also strangely unlike the post-exilic temple described in Hag 2:3.¹¹⁹

The Temple Water System (88–91)

Paragraphs 88–91 continue the discussion of the temple by describing the water system. Copious water in connection with the temple is clear from Ezek 47, although there the water flows like a deepening river from the threshold of the temple to the Dead Sea,¹²⁰ and the Fourth Gospel also refers to considerable quantities water in connection with the temple (John 7:27–39).¹²¹ Aristéas refers to copious water necessary to wash the blood from the sacrifices of “many thousands of animals” (πολλὰι . . . μυριάδες κτηνῶν) that are brought on festival days. He then goes to great lengths to give what purports to be an eyewitness account of the reservoirs and pipes needed to supply this water.¹²² As Honigman shows, however, he depends here on Aristotle, *Politics* 7.3–4. But while Aristotle is interested in military security and the health of the populace, Aristéas, in line with his aim to show the importance of the Jewish temple and its ritual, relates the water to the sacrificial system.¹²³

The Priests (92–95)

In para. 92 Aristéas turns to the priests and their cultic service. With regard to their cultic service he notes at the outset and at the end that they work in “silence” (σιγῇ), giving the impression that the place is empty, even though there were around seven hundred priests as well as the great number of people bringing the sacrifices. Aside from this he notes their reverence, decorum and diligence, and also their physical strength, evident in their manhandling of the sacrificial victims. There is also a place where they rest. No instructions are

118 See the discussion in Wright 2015: 199–200, who demonstrates that much of this description is drawn from the LXX.

119 See also Zech 4:10, and Tob 14:5 which anticipates the splendour of the eschatological temple in contrast to the inadequate second temple; and Josephus *Ant.* 11.81. Hayward 1996:31 surmises that the description may reflect the building work of Simon from Sir 50:1–2.

120 The east-west orientation of the temple in Let. Aris. 88 may have its source in Ezek 47:1.

121 See Beasley-Murray 1999: 113–14 for a discussion of this saying of Jesus over against the “the rite of water-drawing that took place on each of the seven days of the festival [of booths].” See Sir 50:3 for Simon’s repair of a reservoir.

122 Vincent 1909: 559–62 was convinced by this description that Aristéas was giving an eyewitness account. It seems clear that there were reservoirs beneath the temple at the time, see Honigman 2004: 78–80.

123 Honigman 2004: 80–81.

issued: when the time for rest arrives they move to the resting place and others exit the resting place to take up the work.

All in all, it appears to be an idealistic, literary description, an impression supported by the insight that a gentile would not be permitted in the temple to observe the sacrificial activity of the priests.¹²⁴ The number seven hundred differs from that in Pseudo-Hecateaus who refers to not less than fifteen hundred priests,¹²⁵ although this does not refer to the number of priests functioning in the temple at any one time. As for the silence in which the proceedings were carried out, this does not comport well with such texts as 2 Chr 29:27–30.¹²⁶ The resting places in the temple may reflect Euhemerus who refers to dwellings around the temple of Zeus close to the city of Panara.¹²⁷ Honigman relates the impression of good order and decorum to Aristotle and his description of an ideal city.¹²⁸ However, as Wright notes, Aristotle is making an entirely

124 Hadas 1951: 137; Gruen 2013: 2732; Wright 2015: 205.

125 See Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.188.

126 Hayward 1996: 33–34 refers to Hab 2:20; Zech 2:13 (MT, LXX 2:17) where the Hebrew text refers to silence (שָׁמָּה) before יהוה. The LXX renders this word with ἐμβέσσαι, which has the sense of reverence and respect. See also m. Tamid 1:2–4; 3:2; 5:1–2 where the priests give instructions and pronounce blessings, and m. Tamid 3:8 where the sounds from the temple could be heard from Jericho. Hayward (ibid.: 34); Allison 1988: 189–97 and Knohl 1996: 24–26 draw correspondences with the descriptions of heavenly worship in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Qumran where the Hebrew word דְּמָמָה appears, although it seems not to have the precise sense of “silence.” On this see *DCH* 2: 452 where Clines proposes connotations such as “low whispering” and “murmuring,” and *HALOT* 226. In the LXX, דְּמָמָה is never rendered with σιγή (see 3 Kgdms 19:12; Ps 106:29 (LXX); Job 4:16), where the Greek word is αὔρα, defined in BDAG 151 as “a breeze.” In the Sabbath Songs, דְּמָמָה appears in 4Q401 16 2; 4Q402 9 3; 4Q405 18 3, 5; 4Q405 19 7; 4Q405 22 7, 8, 12, 13; 11Q17 VII 10, 11, 14. Sometimes it qualifies the word קוֹל (“sound,” “voice”) indicating that the silence differs from that envisaged in Let. Aris. Newsom 1985: 140–41 connects דְּמָמָה with 1 Kings 19:2, and notes, “the word is associated particularly with the sound of the praise of the cherubim and of the angels closest to the chariot throne of God.” On pp. 313–14 Newsom uses the expression “the sound of divine stillness.” There seems to be little in the Sabbath Songs to correspond with Let. Aris. at this point. On the other hand, Knohl 1996: 24–26 argues that “[d]uring the hundreds of years that had passed since the time of Solomon’s Temple, the practice of silence in the Temple had become well established, until it became a necessary dimension of the priestly cult” (p. 25). On pp. 21–23 he argues for silence during the actual sacrificial activity, with prayers and blessings before and after this.

127 See Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, v. 44.2. See Honigman 2004: 90–91.

128 Ibid. 91. See Aristotle, *Politics*, 7.17–33.

different point from Aristeas, and the influence of Aristotle at this point is faint, and unlikely.¹²⁹

The Clothing of the High Priest (96–99)

After this idealistic description of the priests' service, Aristeas turns to the clothing of the high priest (96–99). The way in which Aristeas describes Eleazar, whom he had called "high priest of the Jews" (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερεύς) in para. 1, adds to the impact of the description of the temple. Everything about the temple and the high priest is magnificent. However, the description is quite different from that of Simon in Sir 50:1–11 where ben Sira only mentions Simon's "glorious robe" (στολή δόξης), concentrating rather on the impact Simon made on the gathered worshippers. Here Aristeas concentrates on the Eleazar's clothing. He begins by noting the "great amazement" (μαγάλη ἐκπληξις) of the members of the delegation when they saw Eleazar carrying out his "priestly service" (λειτουργία). He mentions his "tunic" (χιτῶν)¹³⁰ adorned with precious stones, and with golden bells and coloured pomegranates around the "hem" (ποδήρης),¹³¹ the striking multi-hued "girdle" (ζώνη), the "oracle" (λόγιον), adorned with twelve flashing stones with the names of the patriarchs,¹³² the "tiara" (κίθαρις) and the "mitre" (μίτρα), the "sacred diadem" (καθγιασμένον βασιλειον) engraved with the Tetragrammaton. All these terms apart from the "sacred diadem," a further description of the "mitre," appear in the description of the priestly garments in Exod 28, and as Wright notes this is a regal term, "implicitly affirming . . . that Eleazar as high priest is also the ruler

129 Wright 2015: 205.

130 Unlike Sirach 50:11 where στολή appears, Aristeas uses χιτῶν, which I have translated "tunic." BDAG 1085 notes that this is a garment worn next to the skin, and LSJ 1993 notes that it can refer to "a ceremonial garment worn by a goddess." Josephus *Ant.* 3.153 describes the high priest's "linen shirt" (σινδῶν βυσσίνης) as a χεθομένη, a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew כִּתְיֹן, the word used for the priestly tunic in Exod 28:4, 39–40; 29:5, 8; 39:27; 40:14; Lev 8:7, 13; 10:5; 16:4; Ezra 2:69; Neh 7:69, 71; Sir 45:8. Apart from Ezra 2:69; Neh 7:69, 71; Sir 45:8 the Greek equivalent of this word is χιτῶν.

131 I have followed Wright 2015: 207 in translating ποδήρης with "hem." See also Shutt 1985: 19. In his later discussion Wright (p. 209) comments that the ποδήρης may have been an additional garment, as in Exod 28:4. In Exod 28:31 (LXX 27) it seems to be a part of the Ephod. See HALOT 612.

132 Zeitlin, in a note in Hadas 1951: 138–39, comments that in the second temple period the high priest did not wear the *hoshen* oracle, and consequently proposes that the entire story from para. 83 (also absent from Josephus) was a later addition to Let. Aris., composed after the destruction of the Temple.

of the Judeans,”¹³³ thus on a par with Ptolemy.¹³⁴ Exodus 28 seems to be the source of this description, modified to emphasise the concerns of Aristéas.¹³⁵

In para. 99 Aristéas concludes his description with the comment that the entire spectacle leads to “awe” (φόβος) and “perplexity” (ταραχή), “astonishment” (ἐκπληξίς) and “inexpressible marvelling” (θαυμασμός ἀδιήγητος). Observers would gain the impression that they were in another world.

This last expression is both ambiguous and interesting. Hayward translates, “so as to make one think that he has come close to another man from outside the world,”¹³⁶ (ὥστε νομίζειν εἰς ἕτερον ἐληλυθῆναι ἐκτὸς τοῦ κόσμου), giving the impression that the high priest was perhaps an angelic being.¹³⁷ Others read the text as referring to the observer entering another world.¹³⁸ Whichever way the words are read there is a hint here that either the high priest is like an other worldly being,¹³⁹ or that the temple was another world, perhaps heaven on earth. Given that the texts seem thoroughly Hellenistic, and that this is no more than a single clause in a lengthy description of high priest and temple, certainty is not possible. The ideas are intriguing, nonetheless.¹⁴⁰

Conclusion

Clearly the temple and its cultus is important to Aristéas. He uses considerable space to describe the magnificent gifts sent by Ptolemy for the repair of the temple, and when he embarks upon a description of Judea and Jerusalem, the temple comes first, followed by the priesthood, climaxing in a description of the high priest. Everything is described in superlatives, and there is no hint that there is any disorder or any negative features. His aim is to commend Judaism to his Alexandrian contemporaries, and to explain its positive features, the most important of which is the temple and priesthood. The brief comment that either the high priest is from another world or that the observer

133 Wright 2015: 209.

134 Hayward 1996: 36.

135 For these differences see Wright 2015: 208–10. It would be a diversion for me to discuss the absence of the Urim and Thummim and differences between this description of the flashing stones and that of Josephus in *Ant.* 3.216–218.

136 Hayward 1996: 30, following Andrews 1913: 104.

137 Hayward 1996: 36. Wright 2015: 216 finds nothing in the text to convince him that it ought to be read in this way.

138 Shutt 1985: 19; Hadas 1951: 139; Gruen 2013: 2733; Wright 2015: 207.

139 For this reading see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 157.

140 Fletcher-Louis (*ibid.*: 157) is quite certain: “there can be little doubt that he has translated the angelomorphism of the Qumran text [1QSb iv 24–28] into terms suitable for his Hellenistic readership.”

has entered another world is intriguing, but that is all that can be said. For Aristeas, as far as temple and priesthood is concerned, all is as it should be.

The Wisdom of Solomon

The Wisdom of Solomon probably derives from Alexandria.¹⁴¹ While the precise dating is debated, somewhere in the period 150 BCE to 50 CE seems likely.¹⁴² It was composed in Greek and probably written for the Alexandrian Jewish community, with a view to protecting the readers from the threat of attraction to the surrounding Hellenistic culture.¹⁴³ It is “an exhortation to pursue Wisdom and thereby live the righteous life that issues in immortality.”¹⁴⁴ Alexandrian provenance and a date somewhere around the turn of the era make the author a near contemporary of Philo. There are numerous points of contact with Philo, as well as with apocalyptic and Stoic thought.¹⁴⁵ Connections with the thought world of Hebrews have been noted, and the author of Hebrews seems to have been aware of Wisdom.¹⁴⁶

It was probably composed by a single author, who may have used several sources.¹⁴⁷ It is normally analysed into three parts: the book of eschatology

141 Winston 1979: 25; Evans 1992: 13; Barclay 1996: 452; DeSilva 2002: 127; Nickelsburg 2005: 211. Georgi 1980: 395–96 suggests Syria as an alternative, finding only superficial connections with Egypt.

142 There is no consensus on the date. Larcher 1983: 1: 148–61 considers that it was written progressively between 30–10 BCE. Barclay 1996: 451 assigns a date between 100 BCE and 30 CE. Koester 1989: 58 narrows the date to the period from 30 BCE to 40 CE, while Nickelsburg 2005: 212 narrows it even further, proposing that it was written during the reign of Caligula (37–41 CE), as does Winston 1979: 20–25. Grabbe 1997: 87–90 prefers a date during the reign of Augustus. Georgi 1980: 396–97 suggests a much earlier date near the end of the second century BCE. Winston 1979: 20–24 discusses the critical issues and argues for a first-century date on the basis of words that appear in Wisdom but not elsewhere in Greek literature prior to the first century, as well as historical reminiscences that seem to reflect the period of Roman rule, particularly the riots in Alexandria of 38 CE, rather than the period of the Ptolemies. See 5:16–23; 14:16–20.

143 Gilbert 1984: 312; Grabbe 1997: 94–95.

144 Gilbert 1984: 306–9; Nickelsburg 2005: 205.

145 Grabbe 1997: 45–46, 55–57; Burkes 2002: *passim*; Nickelsburg 2005: 205–7.

146 Schenck 2003: 31 lists a number of parallels between Wisdom and Hebrews. The word ἀπαύγασμα (“brightness”) appears in the LXX only in Wis 7:16 (referring to Wisdom) and in the NT only in Heb 1:3 (referring to the exalted Son of God).

147 Reese 1965: 391–99; 1970: 123–45; Wright 1967: 165–84; Gilbert 1984: 308–9; Collins 1977: 124; Grabbe 1997: 25–26.

(1:1–6:11); the book of wisdom (6:12–9:18); and the book of history (10–19).¹⁴⁸ In the book of wisdom, the Sage takes on the persona of Solomon and presents “the origin, character, deeds and rewards of Wisdom.”¹⁴⁹ He recounts the events of 1 Kings 3:5–15 and, as “Solomon,” offers a carefully structured prayer for wisdom (9:1–18).¹⁵⁰

The central part of the prayer (9:7–12) deals with God’s commission to Solomon to rule and judge his people (v. 7) and to build the temple (v. 8). He asks God to send him wisdom “from the holy heaven and from his throne of glory” (ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης, v. 10) to equip him for these tasks, so that his works will be acceptable and that he will be worthy of his father’s throne (v. 12).

The description of the temple in 9:8 is the only reference to any aspect of the Jewish cult in this central part of Wisdom and is almost incidental to the prayer.¹⁵¹ Solomon is to build the temple “in God’s holy mountain” (ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ σου) and an altar “in the city of God’s habitation” (ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς σου), that is Jerusalem; and the temple is to be a “copy of the holy tent which God prepared from the beginning” (μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας, ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς). The text presents a positive attitude to Solomon’s temple. It is commanded by God and an imitation of what was formerly prepared by God.¹⁵²

The identification of the “holy tent” is a *crux interpretum*. Osty sets out three options: (1) heaven as the true temple of God; (2) a heavenly prototype of the

148 Barclay 1996: 181–82; Grabbe 1997: 18; Harrington 1999: 57–75; DeSilva 2002: 126–28; Nickelsburg 2005: 205. Winston 1979: 9–12 includes chapter 10 with the book of wisdom. Wright 1967: 165 proposes two parts of almost equal length (1:1–11:1 with 560 *stichoi*, and 11:2–19:22 with 561 *stichoi*) and further suggests that 10:1–11:1 provides a transition between the two parts. Wright also finds a variety of rhetorical features, including “symmetrical arrangement, announcement of subjects, *mots crochets*, and inclusions” in Wisdom, and speculates whether this might have been a feature of Alexandrian rhetoric. Since such features have also been detected in Hebrews, he surmises that this might be “another instance of Alexandrian contact in the Epistle to the Hebrews” (p. 184). Contact between Alexandria and Hebrews is generally made in connection with discussions of verbal links with Philo, which, as I argue later in this chapter, are superficial.

149 DeSilva 2002: 128.

150 Gilbert 1984: 303.

151 Koester 1989: 64.

152 Fuller Dow 2010 presents a tendentious reading of Wis 9:8 when she suggests that the temple is “only a copy of a ‘holy tent’ that has existed from the beginning in heaven” (p. 118) and that “the earthly Jerusalem and Temple are *just* copies of the originals in heaven” (p. 127, *italics mine*).

Jerusalem temple; or (3) the tent built by Moses on the guidance of YHWH.¹⁵³ Cornely adds a fourth: the created universe as a prototype of the temple,¹⁵⁴ and Gäbel a fifth. Gäbel detects echoes of Exod 15:17 in Wis 9:8 and proposes that the holy tent is the sanctuary God's hands established in Exod 15:17, in which he will ultimately reign forever, that is, the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people.¹⁵⁵

Identification with the wilderness tabernacle (option 3) is unlikely,¹⁵⁶ since it was built by Moses rather than God. Also unlikely is the suggestion of a heavenly prototype (option 2), since the plan for the temple was David's plan, albeit at YHWH's direction (1 Chr 11–19).¹⁵⁷ One of the remaining options or a combination of them is most likely.

153 Osty 1957: 65 (“le ciel, véritable temple de Dieu . . . un prototype céleste du Temple de Jérusalem . . . la Tente édifiée par Moïse sur les indications de Yahvé.”) For heaven, the dwelling place of God, Osty cites Ps 11:4; 18:7 (MT); Rev 3:12; for the heavenly prototype of the Jerusalem temple he cites Heb 8:2, 5; 9:23; Rev 8:3–4; 11:19; 13:6; 14:18; 15:5; and for the Mosaic tent he cites Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30.

154 Cornely 1910: 348–50. Cornely finds the word προετοιμάζω significant, particularly when juxtaposed as it is with ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, which he considers reinforces the notion that the “world” (*mundum*) was formed as an exemplar for the future sanctuary. Hurst 1990: 37–38, 144 notes that the expression ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς could have the sense of “from the creation,” or “before the creation,” indicating that the author of Wisdom considered this to be when the heavenly sanctuary was built. Προετοιμάζω is rare in the LXX, appearing only here and in Isa 28:24, where it refers to the preparation of soil for planting. In Rom 9:23 it refers to God preparing people for glory, and in Eph 2:10 to God preparing good works as a way of life. BDAG 86g gives the sense of “prepare beforehand.”

155 Gäbel 2006: 32–33, 101 (note 359). The words κατοικητήριον, ὅρος κληρονομίας σου and ἐτοιμάζω appear in Exod 15:17; and κατασκήνωσις, ἐν ᾧ ὅρει ἀγίῳ σου and προετοιμάζω in Wis 9:8. I note also the reference to God's enduring reign in Exod 15:18, and to God's glorious throne in Wis 9:10. Gäbel makes a further connection with Exod 25:8–9, noting the word ἀγίασμα in Exod 15:17 and 25:8, and referring to the “die Verbindung mit der Zeltradition im Sinne eines himmlischen Urbildes,” ultimately concluding that the “holy tent” is a heavenly archetype of the tabernacle and also of Solomon's temple.

156 This option is adopted by Sowers 1965: 108–9, who then suggests that the Sage is thinking of “the tabernacle with its cosmic symbolism” as set out by Philo (see my discussion of Philo's treatment of the design of the tabernacle later in this chapter). For correspondences between Solomon's temple and the tabernacle see Haran 1985: 189–94, and Williamson 1970: 563–64 who also favours this reading of Wis 9:8.

157 A heavenly model for the temple, if indeed there was one is downplayed in 1 Kings, with no plan at all mentioned in chapter 8. Fyall 2004: 49–58 notes that 1 Kings is reticent about the significance of the temple and scarcely refers to it after these chapters.

That the holy tent is either heaven or the created universe (options 1 and 4) finds some support in Wis 18:24, which describes Aaron's priestly robe using the same cosmic symbolism found in Philo and Josephus:

For on his long robe "the whole world" (ὅλος ὁ κόσμος) was depicted, and the glories of the ancestors were engraved on the four rows of stones, and "your majesty" (μεγαλωσύνη σου) was on the diadem upon his head (NRSV).¹⁵⁸

This text reflects the belief that the garments of the high priest depict the cosmos and that the high priest reflects the glory of God.¹⁵⁹

On the other hand, Gäbel's insight that the text echoes Exod 15:17 (option 5) is valuable. The implication is that the temple to be built by Solomon is to resemble the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, prepared beforehand by God. Thus, options 4 and 5 (the created universe as a temple and the eschatological temple to be built by God in the eschaton) merge, with protology and eschatology providing different perspectives on the same reality.

Scholars who read Wis 9:8 as referring to a heavenly archetype of the temple have sometimes seen this idea behind Heb 8:2, 5.¹⁶⁰ Indeed, Cody suggests that this text is essential for the author of Hebrews' understanding the tabernacle as a copy of this heavenly archetype.¹⁶¹ Certainly there are connections between the two works, with the words ἅγιος, σκηνή and ὅρος common to both Wis 9:8 and Heb 8:2, 5. However, I will argue below that Hebrews is silent on the question of a heavenly archetype, instead seeing the temple as a "symbolic foreshadowing" (ὀρόδειγμα καὶ σκιά) of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.¹⁶² If Gäbel's reading of Wis 9:8 is valid, there are indeed connections between the two texts, but not in the way normally proposed. Rather, in Wis 9:8 and, as I will argue, in Heb 8:1–2 the temple anticipates the

158 Cornely 1910: 348–50 makes a connection with Wis 18:24, as well as with Exod 25:9, 40, and with the reference to Wisdom being with God when he made the world in Wis 9:9.

159 Compare Hayward 1996: 112–13, and Barker 2004: 30. Barker claims, "[t]hus the high priest was an angel who had emerged from the holy of holies into the visible creation, and vested himself in the stuff of creation . . . The vested high priest in the temple was the Glory of the Lord veiled in matter." Similar descriptions of the high priest are found in Sir 50; Philo *Spec.* 1.84–85, 93–96; *Mos.* 2.117–125; *Let. Aris.* 96–98. In Wis 18:15 Aaron has gigantic proportions.

160 Moffatt 1924: 106; Nomoto 1968: 17; Attridge 1989: 222; Bruce 1978: 81; 1990: 184; Scholer 1991: 159–60; Ellingworth 1993: 408; DeSilva 2000b: 282; Koester 2001: 378.

161 Cody 1960: 20.

162 See chapter 8, below.

eschatological dwelling of God with his people. In Wis 9:8 God established this “from the beginning” (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς), while in Hebrews it is inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

Verbal similarities between Wis 9:8 and Heb 8:2, 5 are interesting and may indicate that the author of Hebrews was drawing on Wis 9:8 at this point. If so, it is odd that he avoids using μίμημα (“copy”) to describe the relationship between the “true tent” and the temple, preferring a quite different expression (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά).¹⁶³ Hebrews sees the temple as anticipating the eschaton when God will dwell with his people, while the Sage in Wis 9:8 sees the eschatological dwelling place of God, prepared from the beginning, as the pattern for the temple.

Sibylline Oracles

The Sibyl is a legendary figure from ancient Greek and Roman literature, normally depicted as an old woman uttering prophecies of doom,¹⁶⁴ and sibylline prophecy was a pagan phenomenon, appropriated by Jews and Christians. The collection of Jewish and Christian Sibylline Oracles comprises twelve books, written over a space of around seven hundred years from sometime around

¹⁶³ Adams 2009: 132–33. Cody 1960: 20–21 refers to the “views” of the authors of both Wisdom and Hebrews of μίμημα and παράδειγμα. But neither of these words appears in Hebrews, and παράδειγμα does not appear in Wisdom. Μίμημα is a *hapax legomenon* here in the LXX, but appears numerous times in Philo in a variety of contexts, often with reference to earthly things as copies of heavenly things. In *Opif.* 16 the visible world is a copy of an archetypal idea; in *Opif.* 25, 139 humanity is a copy of the divine; in *Leg.* 1.43 Eden is a copy of the archetypal wisdom; in *Leg.* 1.45 earthly virtue is an imitation of heavenly virtue; and in *Aet.* 15 the world is a visible copy of an invisible archetype. Sometimes the copy appears to be inferior to the original (*Opif.* 141; *Post.* 105; *Migr.* 12), although in *Det.* 83, humanity is superior as a result of being made in the divine image. In *Plant.* 50 a similar idea is expressed with reference to the beauty of the created world. In several texts, Philo mentions that the wilderness sanctuary is an imitation of the heavenly one. In *Her.* 112; *Mos.* 2.74; *Det.* 160 Moses’ tent is a copy of the divine model. *Her.* 225 and *Congr.* 8 refer to the seven-branched candlestick being a copy of heavenly light. In *Somn.* 1.215 the priest is a copy of the rational soul, and in *Mos.* 2.117, 143 the high priest’s tunic is a copy of the world. In *Leg.* 3.102 and *Somn.* 1.206 Bezalel makes the tabernacle as a copy of the archetypal form made by Moses. Winston 1979: 203 calls μίμημα a “*vox Platonica*,” arguing for the implication that [heavenly] archetype is greater than the earthly copy. Rather than this, it is more likely that imitation of the holy tent gives it dignity.

¹⁶⁴ Collins 1974c: 1; 1987: 423–27; Barclay 1996: 216–17; Felder 2002: 363–66; Buitenwerf 2003: 92–123; Nickelsburg 2005: 193. See Sib. Or. Prologue 9–90.

the second century BCE. They are written in Greek hexameters and lack any of the features of Hebrew parallelism. Consequently, it is unlikely that they were composed in a Semitic language.¹⁶⁵ They share some of the features of apocalyptic literature,¹⁶⁶ especially those parts displaying an interest in angels and the heavenly world, and in some places there is an interest in the temple. Books 3–5 are relevant to this study. I will treat book 3 in this chapter and books 4 and 5, which post-date the fall of Jerusalem, in chapter 5.

Sibylline Oracles Book 3

Book 3 is the longest of the collection, comprising 829 verses. Verses 1–96 appear to be from a different source,¹⁶⁷ and v. 776 is probably a Christian interpolation.¹⁶⁸ References to Egypt in vv. 159, 161 and to the seventh king of Egypt (vv. 193, 318, 608) are generally held to indicate Egyptian provenance.¹⁶⁹ The rise of the power of Rome referred to in vv. 175–190 indicate a date for the

165 Nickelsburg 2005: 194. For a full discussion of the text of Sib. Or. see Geffcken 1902a: XXI–LIII. For a list of the chief manuscripts see Collins 1983b: 320–21. For introductions to Sib. Or. see Goodman 1986: 618–27; Collins 1983b: 317–24; 1984a: 357–62; 1987: 421–27; 1998: 116–18; Nickelsburg 2005: 193–94.

166 Rowland 1982: 20–21.

167 Collins 1974c: 24–25; 1974b: 2; 1983b: 354; 2004b: 4 (who suggests that these verses conclude book 2); Goodman 1986: 639–40; Buitenwerf 2003: 60–62, 90–91 (who argues that vv. 1–92 were originally part of a book that is no longer extant, and that the start of book 3 has been only partially preserved in Fragments 1 and 3—he includes vv. 93–96 as part of book 3). Nikiprowetzky 1970: 60–66, 217–22 argues that these verses are an integral part of book 3. These verses have little in common with the rest of the book, and his arguments have not generally been accepted.

168 Lanchester 1913: 372; Collins 1983b: 379; Buitenwerf 2003: 289–90. As Charlesworth 1981a: 48 notes, this verse removes the focus from the temple of God to the son of God, leading to several proposed emendations. In his critical apparatus, Geffcken 1902a: 87 notes that Alexandre proposed emending the expression υἱὸν . . . μέγαλοιο θεοῖο (“the son of the great God”) to ναόν . . . μέγαλοιο θεοῖο (“the temple of the great God”), and that Buresch proposed οἶκον (“house”) rather than υἱὸν (“son”). I have been unable to access either of these works. Goodman 1986: 635 thinks that it is “more likely that υἱὸν θεοῖο should be read as νοῦν θεοῖο.” Nikiprowetzky 1970: 234 suggests that the temple is described here “by a sort of hypallage” as “son of the Great God.” See also his translation and notes on pp. 329, 353. Given that the earliest witnesses to the text are from the fifteenth century CE, any of these emendations could be valid, although none is supported by any witness to the text.

169 Lanchester 1913: 371–72; Momigliano 1980: 553; Simon 1983: 220; Goodman 1986: 638; Collins 1987: 430–33; 2000a: 87; 2004b: 17; Gäbel 2006: 39. Against this see Buitenwerf 2003: 130–33, who argues for provenance from Asia Minor, although he mainly does this from vv. 295–488, which are quite different from the rest of the book and probably inserted from a different source.

original core of the book (vv. 97–349, 489–829) around the middle of the second century BCE,¹⁷⁰ making it the oldest book in the collection.¹⁷¹ The theme of the book is that sin, usually idolatry, will lead to disaster, which will come to an end with the advent of a king or kingdom.¹⁷² The author, according to Collins, was “a Jewish propagandist . . . interested in the glory of Judaism.”¹⁷³ Coupled with this are a missionary zeal, an appreciation of Greek culture, and an appeal to the Greeks to turn to the one true God and offer sacrifices in the temple of the great God.¹⁷⁴ There is considerable interest in, and a positive attitude towards the temple.¹⁷⁵

Sib. Or. 3:213–294

The third section of Sib. Or. 3 (vv. 196–294) deals with the Babylonian exile, the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple. It begins with a series of woes against various nations (vv. 196–209), which the sibyllist declines to elaborate further. She then announces that evil is about to come upon the pious men (213) descended from righteous men (214–215) who “live around the great temple of Solomon” (ναδὼν οἰκείουσι μέγαν Σολομώνιον, vv. 213–214). She then digresses to outline the history of the Israelites, beginning with God’s call of Abraham (v. 218) down to the giving of the law (215–264). While this early

170 That Book 3 is a composite work with its origins in the second century BCE was apparently first argued by Geffcken 1902b. See now Collins 1974c: 21–22, 24–33 and many subsequent works; Goodman 1986: 633–38; Barclay 1996: 218–19; Bauckham 2001: 186; Nickelsburg 2005: 195, and the history of research in Buitenwerf 2003: 5–64. The second century date has been challenged by Nikiprowetzky 1970: 195–225 (who argues that the book is a single composition written in the first century BCE); Gruen 1998: 269–79 and Buitenwerf 2003: 124–34. See the counter-arguments in Collins 2004b: 8–18 and Nickelsburg 2005: 195, both of whom argue that vv. 350–488, comprising oracles against other nations (as compared with the remainder of the book, which deals with internal Egyptian matters), were apparently inserted at a later date, and may have pagan authorship (Collins 1983b: 357–59; Goodman 1986: 635–37; Davila 2005b: 182–83). As Barclay 1996: 219 and Davila 2005b: 186 point out, either the second or first century BCE fits the evidence. Josephus alludes to vv. 97–107 (*Ant.* 1.118–119), although this information could have come from Alexander Polyhistor rather than directly from Sib. Or. (Davila *ibid.*: 185).

171 Collins 2004b: 4.

172 Collins 2000a: 87.

173 Collins 2004b: 18, see also 1994: 57–58; Davila 2005b: 183–84.

174 Collins 1974a: 366; 1994: 59; Chester 1991: 44–45; Davila 2005b: 185. Collins 1974c: 47 comments that “interest in the temple . . . seems to have been characteristic of the sibylline literature of Egyptian Judaism.”

175 For a summary of the material in Sib. Or. 3 concerning the temple, and the positive light in which it is viewed, see Chester 1991: 38; Davila 2005b: 184; Gäbel 2006: 39.

history is overwhelmingly positive, the sibyllist concludes that evil will come upon these people. Because of their wickedness and idolatry and their refusal to worship God, they will not escape (vv. 277–279).

This evil is the Assyrian exile, although it is described in terms of the Babylonian exile,¹⁷⁶ including, most notably, the destruction of the temple and Israel's exile from the “holy ground” (πέδον ἁγνόν, v. 267). The temple is described as “a very beautiful shrine” (περικαλλέα σηκόν, v. 266)¹⁷⁷ and the “temple of the great God” (ναὸς μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, v. 274), and v. 281 refers to “the wonders of the temple” (θαύματα σηκοῦ). Verses 282–285 contain hope for the future: if God's people continue to trust in God's law then “God will send a king from heaven” (θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα, v. 286)¹⁷⁸ who will judge them, and “a certain royal tribe” (τις φυλὴ βασιλῆιος, v. 288), i.e. the Jews, will begin “to raise up a new temple of God” (καὶ καινὸν σηκὸν θεοῦ ἄρξετ' ἐγείρειν, v. 290). Then “the temple will again be as it was before” (καὶ τότε δὴ ναὸς πάλιν ἔσσεται, ὡς πάρος ἦεν, v. 294).

Here Solomon's temple is described in positive terms, highlighting its beauty, greatness and wonders. This is God's great temple and there is no hint of any dissatisfaction with it.¹⁷⁹ The positive attitude carries over to the rebuilt temple, which will be “as it was before.” God is behind the rebuilding. He sends the king who will restore them to their land and enable it to begin.¹⁸⁰

Sib. Or. 3:545–656

This section castigates the “Greeks” for their idolatry, contrasting them with the Jews, a holy race of pious men (v. 573). The Greeks can avoid the disaster of war by sacrificing burnt-offerings of cattle and loud-bellowing bulls “at the temple

176 The sibyllist regards the Assyrians and Babylonians as equivalent as v. 160 shows, referring to “Assyrian Babylon” (Ἀσσυρίης Βαβυλωνός). See Collins 1983b: 368; Buitenwerf 2003: 205.

177 For σηκός as “temple, shrine” see 2 Macc 14:33. The word is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX, but refers to the temple four times in Sib. Or. 3 (vv. 266, 281, 290, 665), once in Sib. Or. 5:293 (the temple of Artemis of Ephesus), and once in Eupolemos, *Frag.* 34:6 as part of a description of Solomon's temple.

178 For the reading θεὸς οὐρανόθεν see Buitenwerf 2003: 207. Geffcken 1902a: 63 reads θεὸς οὐράνιος (“heavenly God”).

179 Gäbel 2006: 39; Wardle 2010: 89.

180 Discussion of the identity of this king is beyond my scope. Lanchester 1913: 384; Collins 1974c: 38–39; 1983b: 368; Simon 1983: 232; Buitenwerf 2003: 207–8. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 133–35 argues that Cyrus is a Davidide, and Nolland 1979: 158–66 argues that hidden under the reference to Cyrus is a typological scheme pointing to a Davidic Messiah and an eschatological temple that this Messiah will build.

of the great God" (πρὸς ναὸν μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, v. 565),¹⁸¹ as the Jews do. "They fully honour the temple of the great God" (οἱ ναὸν μέγαλοιο θεοῦ περικυδανέουσιν, v. 575),¹⁸² with drink offerings, the odour of burnt offering and sacred sacrifices (v. 576); sacrifices of well-fed bulls, unblemished rams, and firstborn sheep (vv. 577–578); and burnt offerings of fat flocks of lambs on a great altar, in a holy manner (βωμῶ ἐπὶ μεγάλῳ ἁγίῳς ὁλοκαρπεύοντες, v. 579). Near the end of the section the sibyllist issues another appeal to the Greeks: turn back, be converted and propitiate God. They are to sacrifice hundreds of bulls, firstborn lambs and goats to God at the appropriate times (vv. 625–627).

While there are also ethical demands made on the Greeks, the opening and closing *inclusio* in this section is cultic, and the central section praises the Jews for their close attention to cultic matters. The whole section reflects a positive attitude to the temple and cultus.

Sib. Or. 3:657–808

This section begins with the summary statement that the "temple of the great God will be laden with very beautiful riches" (ναὸς δ' αὖ μέγαλοιο θεοῦ περικαλλεῖ (sic) πλούτῳ, v. 657).¹⁸³ While some will want to pillage it, they will fail since God will defend his temple with cosmic phenomena (vv. 669–709).¹⁸⁴ The reason for the great wealth is that people "from every land" (πάσης δ' ἐκ γαίης, v. 772) will bring incense and gifts "to the houses . . . of the great God" (πρὸς οἴκους . . . μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, vv. 772–773,¹⁸⁵ see also v. 718), and all God's people will live in peace around it. The conditions described reflect the eschatological

181 See the critical apparatus in Geffcken 1902a: 77 for the textual variants in v. 564, and Buitenwerf 2003: 257–58, who notes that "it is impossible to reconstruct the original Greek text in detail." I have followed Geffcken's text. None of the variant readings impact the points being made here.

182 For the translation "fully honour" see Collins 1983b: 35. περικυδαίνω does not appear in *LSJ*. κυδαίνω is "to honour or glorify" (*LSJ* 1005), and περκυδής has the sense "very famous" (*LSJ* 1378).

183 The Φ group of MSS read λαός at the start of this line and the ψ group read λαούς. The reading ναός was proposed by Geffcken 1902a: 82, followed by Buitenwerf 2003: 276, since the immediate context describes the wealth of the temple.

184 Barclay 1996: 220–21; Buitenwerf 2003: 277. This section contains allusions to Ps 2 where the kings of the earth rise up against God who has set his king on Zion with God's decisive response; and to 2 Macc 3 where Heliodorus plans to rob the temple and God protects it with what appear to be angelic beings (see Collins 1974c: 44, 49–50).

185 For the plural οἴκους referring to the temple see Buitenwerf 2003: 283, 289. οἶκος refers to the house(hold) of Solomon in v. 167, to private homes in v. 314, to the temple in vv. 328–329, 726 (plural), 772, 774 and to Noah's Ark in v. 825.

pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem in such texts as Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2; Zech 14:16.¹⁸⁶ This is a picture of the eschatological kingdom to be sure (see vv. 767–795), but it is an entirely earthly kingdom, and the temple is the second temple. There is no expectation that the Messiah will come to build an eschatological temple; the second temple is adequate.¹⁸⁷

Conclusion

Sibylline Oracles 3 reflects a clear theological commitment to and a positive attitude towards Jerusalem and the temple. Commitment to the great God and his temple and the proper observance of cultic matters will ensure salvation for Jew and Greek alike. There is no sense of dissatisfaction with the priesthood and the cult, and no reference to a heavenly temple. Even the eschatological kingdom seems to be centred on the existing temple. There is no suggestion that the Messiah or God will come and build an eschatological temple in the last days.

Philo of Alexandria

Philo was a Diaspora Jew who lived from 20–15 BCE to 45–50 CE.¹⁸⁸ He produced a considerable body of literature, much of which retells the Pentateuch.¹⁸⁹ Philo visited Jerusalem, perhaps once in his lifetime,¹⁹⁰ “to pray and sacrifice”

186 Simon 1983: 228.

187 Collins 1974c: 45–47; Buitenwerf 2003: 291–92. Chester 1991: 45–47 argues that the text may indicate a new temple without explicitly saying so, and that the lavish description of the new temple (vv. 657–660) “clearly reflects, *inter alia*, something of the yearning for the fulfilment of the lavish descriptions of Deutero-Isaiah [sic?] and Ezekiel and disappointment and sense of anti-climax about the form of the Second Temple that is reflected elsewhere in Jewish texts.” On the contrary, there seems to be no disappointment with the second temple, especially considering v. 294, where the rebuilt temple after the exile is predicted to be “as it was before.” Sanders 1985a: 85–88 argues that hopes for rebuilding Jerusalem must also involve hopes for rebuilding the temple. But the texts he cites that look to this are drawn from Sib. Or. 5 rather than from Sib. Or. 3.

188 Borgen 1984: 252.

189 Nickelsburg 2005: 212. For a discussion of the term “rewritten bible,” or “rewritten Scripture” see Vermes 1961: 95; Harrington and Horgan 1986: 239–40; Crawford 2008: 1–15; Brooke 2010: 42–44, and for critique see Najman 2003: 7–10; Campbell 2005: 48–50; Bernstein 2005: 169–96; Petersen 2007: 285–306.

190 Schenck 2005: 14; Krauter 2007: 66. Martin 2000: 237 suggests that Philo may have made more than one such pilgrimage and that the “casual manner” in which he refers to the

(εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων, *Prov.* 2.64). Consequently, he would not have had an intimate first-hand experience of the temple and cultus, instead gaining his understanding from the biblical text, where he deals mainly with the wilderness tabernacle.¹⁹¹ Philo is important to this study because of proposed similarities between the writings of Philo and Hebrews. A comprehensive discussion of this relationship is beyond my scope, and indeed has been done many times.¹⁹² Here I simply examine selected references to the temple and tabernacle.

Philo's Attitude to the Temple

Clearly, Philo had a positive view of Herod's temple. In *Flacc.* 46 he refers to the way Diaspora Jews view Jerusalem as their "capital city" (μητρόπολις), but immediately qualifies this with the remark that it is a "holy city" (ιερόπολις) containing "the holy temple of the Most High God" (ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὺς ἅγιος). To Philo, the most significant aspect of the city is that it contains the holy temple.¹⁹³

This attitude becomes clearer when Philo describes the report he received concerning Caligula's proposal to erect a statue of himself in the holy of holies and the responses to that event (*Legat.* 186–329).¹⁹⁴ Philo was part of a delegation to Caligula to protest at the desecration of Alexandrian synagogues. While awaiting Caligula's summons the delegation was accosted by a grief-stricken man bearing a report of Caligula's proposal to erect this statue (186–188).

temple here suggests that the "actual physical act of pilgrimage to the Temple does not possess a high profile in his surviving written output."

191 Früchtel 1968: 99; Martin 2000: 237 (note 76).

192 Runia 1993: 74–78; Schenck 2005: 81–86. Those who conclude that the relationship has been overstated include Barrett 1954: 363–93; Burtneiss 1958: 54–64; Williamson 1970; Hurst 1984; 1990: 7–42. For more positive assessments see Sowers 1965; MacRae 1978; Runia 1993: 74–78; Sterling 2001; Schenck 2002. I have discussed this relationship briefly in chapter 1, (above).

193 Leonhardt-Balzer 2007: 49. It is beyond my scope to discuss Philo's attitude to the sacrificial system and to sacrifices in general, a subject that has been the subject of considerable debate. See Williamson 1970: 164–74; Fuglseth 2005: 192–93. For the view that Philo was engrossed with the cosmic symbolism, but uninterested in the actual temple, see Heinemann 1973: 45–57; Früchtel 1968: 81. Martin 2000: 209–28, 231–34 suggests on the basis of *Flacc.* 46 that "the Temple does not constitute Jerusalem's *raison d'être*." He underestimates Philo's view of the significance of the temple, since most significant thing Philo says about Jerusalem in this text is that the temple is there.

194 In what follows I depend largely on Leonhardt-Balzer 2007: 48–51; see also Fuglseth 2005: 196–98.

On receiving this news they were struck with terror, recognising that the impetus for their delegation paled into insignificance in the face of the desecration of the temple. They were about to appeal to Caligula for protection of the synagogues, but concluded that the “destroyer of the all-holy” (τῷ λυμεῶνι τοῦ πανιέρου) would pay no attention to a complaint about such lesser things as synagogues.¹⁹⁵ Caligula was planning to treat with contempt the “famous and resplendent temple” (τὸν περισημότατον καὶ ἐπιφανέστατον νεών), admired by all people from the east and the west, and regarded as the “sun which shines everywhere” (ἡλίου τρόπον πανταχόσε λάμποντα, 191). Nevertheless, they resolved to continue with their efforts to meet with Caligula, even if it cost them their lives (192–196). The desecration of the temple was seen as a threat to Jews everywhere, since it was an essential sign of Jewish identity. In comparison, the desecration of synagogues was a local affair, albeit serious.¹⁹⁶

Philo notes others who joined him in his esteem for the temple. The great mass of Jews in Palestine protested to Petronius, the governor of Syria (207–253), and Agrippa even went into a coma on hearing the news of the proposed desecration (263–270). Agrippa later appealed to Caligula not to carry out his threatened actions. He described himself as a Jew from the city that is home to “the holy temple of the Most High God” (ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἅγιος, 278). He appealed for the nation (278–280), the city (279–289) and finally (and climactically) the temple (290–320). He offered to give up everything for the sake of the preservation of the ancient customs and laws of his people (321–329).

More details of Philo’s attitude to the temple are found in *Spec.* 1.67–78. After claiming that “the highest, and in truth, the holy temple of God”

195 Martin 2000: 58–62 discusses significance of synagogues as sacred space. He examines epigraphic and literary evidence from the Mediterranean Diaspora and in Palestine from the third century BCE to the sixth century CE and finds synagogues referred to with Greek terms such as ἅγιος (“holy”), ἁγιότατος (“most holy”) and also with Hebrew words associated with the root שִׁבָּץ. On pp. 175–81 Martin discusses the impact of the desecration of the Alexandrian synagogues in Philo’s writings, and makes it quite clear that these were not “mere synagogues.” It was a serious issue; the Jews no longer had places for worship since their synagogues had been rendered unfit for this purpose. In *Flacc.* 48, Philo refers to synagogues as “sacred places” (ἱεροὶ περιβόλοι) and in *Mos.* 2.231 he refers to parts of the temple with the same words.

196 See *Legat.* 191. On pp. 244–47 Martin argues that “the loss of the Temple *per se* is not characterised as a fatal blow to Jewish life.” Rather, he sees it as “the first step in the rescinding of the rights to lead a Jewish life anywhere in the world.” He reads Philo here as though the temple was the defining character of Judaism, which does not accord with his underestimation of the significance of the temple to Philo elsewhere in his thesis.

(τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ)¹⁹⁷ is “the whole universe” (τὸν σύμπαντα . . . κόσμον, 66),¹⁹⁸ Philo embarks upon a description of “the temple made with hands” (τὸ δὲ χειρόκμητον, 67). This temple was necessary to satisfy human impulses for worship and, since God is one, there should only be one temple to which all people should come. This they do (67–69). In *Spec.* 1.71 he describes the costly adornment of the outer enclosure, then the outer court, which was less elaborate, and finally in 1.72 the temple itself, which was “better than words can describe” (παντὸς λόγου κρείττων). He then moves to the holy of holies (“the invisible inner parts,” τὰ . . . ἔνδον ἀόρατα) and gives a brief description of the Day of Atonement ritual. He concludes by again describing the beauty of the buildings, whose magnificence is universally admired by all who see them, especially foreigners, who can compare them with their own public buildings and “be amazed at their beauty and luxury” (ἐκπλήττονται τὸ τε κάλλος ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν, 1.73).

Philo has no conception of an inadequate temple; rather he views it positively. It is very beautiful; it is unique; it is the defining mark of the Jewish people, and indeed, people come from everywhere with the contributions for the temple (78). Its desecration threatens all Jews. There is no suggestion of a corrupt priesthood or temple. All is as it should be.

The Design of the Tabernacle

Philo describes the construction of the tabernacle several times. A brief description appears in *Leg.* 3.102–3, where the influence of Plato’s theory of ideas emerges.¹⁹⁹ The “idea” is the “eternal, intangible, immutable” and incorporeal reality behind the physical manifestation of an object. Philo discusses the role of Bezalel in constructing the tabernacle. He speculates that Moses “fabricated the archetypes” (τὰ ἀρχέτυπα τεχνιτεύει) of the tabernacle and its contents and that Bezalel constructed “copies of these” (τὰ τούτων μιμήματα). He concludes that Moses had God as his teacher, a claim he supports with what appears to be a conflation of Exod 25:9 and 25:40, “you shall make everything according

197 Translation from Hayward 1996: 109.

198 For κόσμος as the universe see BDAG 561, s.v. κόσμος, 3.

199 In *Timaeus* 28a–29b Plato discusses the way a craftsperson making something changeable keeps his eye on what is unchanging and uses that as a “pattern” (παράδειγμα). This, he argues, is how the universe was formed. The creator had his eye on the “eternal” (αἰδιος), so that it was crafted on this unchanging pattern, and consequently is a copy of it. Following this, Plato refers to the universe as “the imitation of the pattern” (μίμημα δὲ παραδείγματος). Wolfson 1968: 200–217 describes this theory as “[t]he starting point of Philo’s philosophy” (p. 200).

to the pattern that was shown to you on the mountain" (κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις).²⁰⁰ Since Moses was commanded to make the tabernacle and its contents, but Bezalel actually made them, Moses must have made the archetypes.²⁰¹

Philo describes the construction of the tabernacle at greater length in *Mos.* 2.70–108, 136–140. He rewrites Exod 25–40, omitting considerable detail and adding his own philosophical and theological interpretation. He begins by giving the rationale for the “movable temple” (φορητόν . . . ἱερόν): the people needed to worship and to offer sacrifices while travelling. Indeed, had they been a settled people, they would have built a “magnificent temple” (περισημότατον νεών) in a “holy city” (ἱερόπολις). Consequently, Moses decided to build a “tent . . . a most holy undertaking” (σκηνήν . . . ἔργον ἱερώτατον), the details of which were given by God in precise commands. Employing Plato’s theory of ideas, Philo claims that Moses “contemplated with his soul” (τῇ ψυχῇ θεωρῶν) the “immaterial forms” (ἀσωματους ἰδέας) that were about to be “brought to completion” (ἀποτελεῖσθαι). “From the original draft and mental patterns” (ἀπ’ ἀρχετύπου γραφῆς καὶ νοητῶν παραδειγμάτων), he made “sense-perceptible copies” (αἰσθητὰ μιμήματα).

He explains himself more clearly in *Mos.* 2.76, which Colson translates as follows:

So the shape of the model (ὁ . . . τύπος τοῦ παραδείγματος) was stamped upon the mind of the prophet, a secretly painted or moulded prototype, produced by immaterial and invisible forms; and the then resulting work

200 Philo seems to rely on a Greek translation of the OT (see *Mos.* 2.26–44, where he seems to cite Let. Aris.), and there is no indication that he had any knowledge of Hebrew (Schenck 2005: 10). The expression τὸ παράδειγμα appears in Exod 25:9, while the remaining words in his allusion appear in 25:40 where τὸν τύπον appears in place of τὸ παράδειγμα. The word πάντα appears in neither verse, although πάντων τῶν σκευῶν appears in 25:8. Heb 8:5 quotes the same words from Exod 25:40 (with τὸν τύπον rather than τὸ παράδειγμα, also adding πάντα). Either the author of Hebrews was familiar with Philo’s text or both writers relied on a tradition that included πάντα. The author of Hebrews avoids παράδειγμα, but it is impossible to tell whether this avoidance was intentional, although Williamson 1970: 112–13 thinks it was, as also Schenck 2005: 84, who refers to the author’s avoidance of “the more explicitly Platonic *paradeigma* of Exodus 25:9.”

201 Hurst 1990: 140 (note 119) notes, “[a]t this point the distance of *Auctor* [of Hebrews] from Philo is not merely linguistic, it is strikingly conceptual.” Nowhere in Hebrews does Moses make an archetype for Bezalel to copy, rather Moses simply “completes” (ἐπιτελέω) the tent (8:5). Barnard 2012: 96–97 also stresses the significant differences between Philo and the author of Hebrews at this point.

was built in accordance with that shape by the artist impressing the stamping upon the material substances required in each case.²⁰²

Thus, for Philo, Moses “saw” with his mind an immaterial archetypal pattern and reproduced a prototype of the wilderness shrine from this. What is clear to Philo, however, is that the design of the tabernacle, which he describes in the following paragraphs, was of divine origin. Exodus 25 makes that clear, but Philo emphasises it by explaining how it took place. The divine origin of the tabernacle gives it a stamp of divine approval and great dignity.²⁰³

Philo’s next step is to describe in detail the different parts of the tabernacle (77–108). As he does so, he invests it with cosmological significance.²⁰⁴ In paragraphs 77–83 he mentions the fifty-five pillars, noting that fifty-five is a significant number, being the sum of the digits from one to ten (79). Five pillars were in the outer court, representing the five senses, leaving fifty, “a most holy number” (ἀγιώτατος πεντηκοντάδος ἀριθμός), the “symbol of a right-angled triangle . . . the original source from which the universe springs” (80).²⁰⁵

In 2:84–88 Philo describes the “curtains” (αὐλαία) and the “veil” (καταπέτασμα), finding significance in the numerical values of the measurements, the materials they were made of and their colours. The four materials are “fine linen” (βύσσος, bright white), representing the earth; “purple” (πορφύρα) representing water; the “dark red” (ὑάκινθος, blue) denoting the air; and “scarlet” (κόκκινος) representing fire.²⁰⁶ Thus, the curtain represents the four elements of the universe. Philo concludes that it was necessary that the “handmade temple” (ἱερὸν χειροποίητον) should be constructed of the same elements of which God made “the All.”²⁰⁷ Furthermore, the lamp stand represents the seven planets (102–103),²⁰⁸ and the candlestick, incense altar and incense are symbols of heaven and earth respectively (105).

Cosmic symbolism emerges elsewhere in Philo.²⁰⁹ The ark of the covenant signifies the intelligible world, and the holy of holies the incorporeal world (*QE* 2.68–69);²¹⁰ the forecourt signifies heaven, earth and sea in *Her.* 221–229,

202 Philo 1929–1962: 6: 487.

203 Koester 2001: 383.

204 See the discussion in Goodenough 1935: 97–99; 107–9. This was not original to Philo. See Früchtel 1968: 81–88.

205 Translation from Colson (Philo 1929–1962: 6: 489).

206 Colson (*ibid.*: 489–93).

207 Similar ideas are expressed in *QE* 2.85, *Congr.* 116–117, see Daniélou 1957: 83–90.

208 In *QE* 2.73–81 it is a symbol of heaven (73) and the planets (76–81). See also *Her.* 221.

209 See the table in Koester 1989: 60. See also Laporte 1983: 111–12.

210 Elsewhere the holy of holies symbolises heaven as in *Spec.* 1.66. See Daniélou 1957: 86.

and the perceptible world in *QE* 2.83; the outer court signifies the perceptible world in *Ebr* 134; and the table and twelve loaves the twelve months of the year (*Spec.* 1.172).

Conclusion

This brief survey of Philo's writings on the temple and tabernacle demonstrates his positive attitude to the temple. Using philosophical ideas drawn from Plato, he explains the divine origin of the temple, and from features of its design he extrapolates that it had cosmic significance, representing the universe.

Two aspects of this are relevant to my study. First, Philo's attitude to the temple was quite different from that found in Hebrews, where it prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, and having now reached its *telos* has no further function.²¹¹ Secondly, scholars have claimed that the author of Hebrews is indebted to Philo for his view of the relationship between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries, particularly in Heb 8:5, where it is argued that the tabernacle is a shadowy copy of the heavenly sanctuary. This does justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews. In Philo the archetype is not a heavenly sanctuary, but something built by Moses, based on the "immaterial form" (ἀσώματος ἰδέα) existing in the mind of God. Nor is there any spatial dualism with a heavenly sanctuary "above" and the earthly replica "below." For Philo the wilderness sanctuary with its cosmic symbolism represents the universe,²¹² an idea that is absent from Hebrews.

2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse)

Andersen claims that "[i]n every respect 2 Enoch remains an enigma. As long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes"²¹³ Nevertheless, this has not deterred scholars from debating its date, location and provenance. Indeed, Andersen himself proposes that it is a Jewish document, composed in Greek late in the first century CE.²¹⁴ Orlov

211 I discuss this reading of Heb 8:5 in chapter 8 (below).

212 See Hayward 1996: 109, "the Temple in some manner represents the universe." Two other temples appear in *Somn.* 1.215, one being the world (ὁ κόσμος) and the other the rational soul (λογική ψυχή).

213 Andersen 1983: 97.

214 Ibid.: 91–97. The absence of any distinctive Christian content, Enoch's "exalted position as God's chosen and prime agent" and details of the miraculous conception of Melchizedek and his spontaneous birth from a dead mother (71:12–23) make Christian provenance

concurs, with the added refinement that interest in the Jerusalem cult, as well as the command to visit the temple three times each day (51:4), makes a date prior to 70 CE likely.²¹⁵ Charles located 2 Enoch in Egypt, probably Alexandria, and this has generally been accepted,²¹⁶ although Andersen is unsure.²¹⁷ The work exists in a longer (J) and a shorter (A) recension, and scholars debate which of these is more likely to be original. The truth probably lies somewhere between the two, with both “expansions and compressions.”²¹⁸ Until recently it was extant only in Old Church Slavonic with no manuscript dated prior to the fourteenth century.²¹⁹ The recent discovery of Coptic fragments of the shorter recension indicate that Charles was probably correct in assigning Egyptian provenance.²²⁰

-
- unlikely (Nickelsburg 2005: 225; Macaskill 2007: 197–98). Furthermore, an anagram connecting the name of Adam with the points of the compass in 30:13 is only valid in Greek. On the other hand, the anagram does not appear in the short recension, and the presence of numerous Semitisms suggests a Hebrew or Aramaic original (Macaskill 2012: 101). For Andersen's opinion on the date see the words “Late First Century A.D.” under the heading on p. 91. Bow 2000: 33–41 argues that it is a Christian work explaining the details surrounding the treatment of Melchizedek in Heb 7:1–10. But the exalted place given to Enoch makes Christian provenance unlikely, as does the Melchizedek story, which contains no Christian elements (Stone 1984: 408; Pearson 1998: 184). It is generally acknowledged that 2 En. 71:34–37; 72:6–7 referring to “another Melchisedek” are a Christian interpolation, see Andersen 1983: 208–11 and Böttrich 2001: 452–54, who also argues that 71:32–33 are interpolated, a point disputed by Orlov 2003b: 275 (note 2).
- 215 Orlov 2005a: 320–33; 2012: 102–16. See also Charles 1913d: 429; Dean-Otting 1984: 225; Orlov 2004b: 176–87; Nickelsburg 2005: 225; Böttrich 2012: 52–57. Milik 1976: 109–12 proposed that it was written in the ninth–tenth centuries by a Byzantine monk, but this view is no longer considered credible, see Collins 1983a: 533 (note 7) and Orlov 2005a: 324–26.
- 216 Charles 1913d: 426; Nickelsburg 2005: 225. See also Himmelfarb 1993: 38, 43–44, 84–86; Collins 1998: 246–47; Böttrich 2001: 455–56.
- 217 Andersen 1983: 96 mentions Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor and Iran as possible places of origin.
- 218 Nickelsburg 2005: 221. Nickelsburg himself favours the short recension. See the discussions in Andersen 1983: 92–94 and Böttrich 1991: 35–36, 40; 2001: 448–49 (who favours the long recension). Prior to Andersen's translation the most influential version of 2 Enoch was Vaillant 1952, who favoured the shorter recension (pp. v–viii), as do Stone 1984: 406–7 and Puech 1993: 1: 176. Orlov 2005a: 148 declines to express an opinion on the priority of either recension, arguing that subscribing to the priority of either, “deceptively oversimplifies the problem” (p. 225), so also Vermes and Goodman 1987: 746.
- 219 Andersen 1983: 91–94.
- 220 Barnard 2012: 37–38. For the details of these fragments, including photographs, translation and commentary see Hagen 2012: 7–34. Hagen dates the fragments somewhere between the eighth and the tenth centuries CE, making them the oldest MS evidence for

Chapters 3–37 deal with Enoch’s heavenly journey. It retells 1 En. 14–16; 17–36 with numerous embellishments, including a seven heaven schema. The earthly priesthood is almost entirely absent,²²¹ and Enoch’s status as a heavenly priest is muted when compared with earlier Enochic literature. In chapters 38–68 Enoch returns for thirty days to give ethical instructions to his descendants, encouraging them to visit the temple three times daily and instructing them on sacrificial practices. He departs for heaven from Akhuzan (Jerusalem),²²² where his sons construct an altar. Chapters 69–73 may be an appendix added at a very early date,²²³ explaining the continuity of the priesthood from Methuselah to his grandson Nir, and then to Nir’s son Melchizedek.

There is no explicit criticism of the temple or cultus in 2 En. 1–68.²²⁴ The command to visit the temple three times daily and the instructions on sacrificial practices indicate a positive attitude to both.²²⁵ Moreover, the text argues for great antiquity for the priesthood, and associates it with Zion and Jerusalem (Akhuzan) from the outset. Zion and Akhuzan are located at the centre of the earth where Adam was born and from where Enoch was taken to heaven.

Chapters 69–73 are a little different, supporting the suggestion that it may be a later interpolation. If the temple was still standing, the author/editor of these chapters would have been aware of the lineage of the Levitical

2 Enoch (pp. 14–16). Böttrich 2012: 58–59 locates the provenance of 2 Enoch in “the important Jewish metropolis of Alexandria,” noting “no less than eighteen items which show a close connection to religious ideas originating primarily in Hellenistic Egypt.”

221 Enoch counsels his sons 2 En. 2:2: “Bless the Lord with the firstborn of your herds and the firstborn of your children.” This implies animal sacrifice and some form of priesthood.

222 I discuss the identification of Akhuzan with Jerusalem below.

223 Sacchi 1990: 233–49. See also Collins 1983a: 535; Himmelfarb 1993: 41–42; Gieschen 1997: 366–68; 1998: 173; Bow 2000: 33–35. Horton 1976: 81 declines to deal with Melchizedek in 2 Enoch as he considers it to be a late interpolation, falling “far beyond the bounds” of his study. Forbes 1913: 469 concluded his translation at the end of 2 En. 68. For a more favourable assessment of these chapters see Böttrich 2001: 446–47.

224 Himmelfarb 1993: 43; Mach 2000: 251; Carlsson 2004: 92. For a contrary view see Sacchi 1990: 243, who argues that since the binding of the legs of sacrificial animals (59:3) was not practised in Jerusalem, 2 Enoch is “strongly critical of the Jerusalem temple.” He also disputes the identification of Akhuzan with Jerusalem, proposing a group with a different temple (Leontopolis?). The evidence for the non-binding of animals in Jerusalem is late (see m. Tamid 4.1), and it is just as credible to imagine that the author was a Diaspora Jew who had never visited the temple and never observed the sacrificial rituals. Himmelfarb 1993: 42–43 argues that the leg binding regulation is polemic against heathen sacrificial customs. Orlov 2000: 34 wonders if the practice of leg binding emanated from a sect whose practice differed from that of the Jerusalem temple.

225 Barnard 2012: 40.

priesthood. But he overlooks this lineage, tracing instead the priestly line from Seth to Melchizedek, who is taken to Paradise in Eden, permanently. One could infer from this that the current priesthood is illegitimate, and that the chapters emanate from a group dissatisfied with that priesthood.²²⁶

Enoch and the Temple

The first hint of a positive attitude to the temple is in 51:4 where Enoch tells his sons that it is good to go to the Lord's temple three times daily: morning, noon and night.²²⁷ To this, recension A adds "to glorify the Author of all things." This is complemented with references to appropriate sacrificial practices in 59:2; 61:4; and 62:1.²²⁸

Enoch embarks on his heavenly journey from Akhuzan (64:2), usually explained as a transliteration of the אֶחְזָן, which is probably related to the word אֶחְזָה, referring to the "special property of God," that is, Jerusalem,²²⁹ and Enoch's descendants farewell him from there as the one who "carries away the sin of mankind" (64:5).²³⁰ The claim that Enoch carries away sin only appears here in 2 Enoch and there is no explanation given.²³¹ In 68:5, Methuselah and

226 Gieschen 1997: 368–69. This is a difficult decision to make. There is no explicit criticism of the priesthood, and it could be argued that the tracing of the priestly lineage back to Seth gives it great antiquity and prestige; on the other hand, Melchizedek's removal to Paradise forever (72:5) could signal the end of any legitimate earthly priesthood.

227 Andersen 1983: 179 (note c), notes variant readings here, with some MSS reading "house of God," and others "the Lord's church" an obvious drift to Christian terminology." He argues that the best attested reading is "the Lord's temple." For devotion three times a day see Ps 55:17; Dan 6:10; and Acts 2:15; 3:1 and 10:9 (read together).

228 In 62:1 gifts are to be brought "with faith," so as to receive remission of sins. Andersen (ibid.: 188, note b) identifies the reference to faith as a Christian gloss. Compare Heb 11:6 where those who approach God must believe that he is and that he rewards those who seek him.

229 HALOT 32. See Ezek 48:20–22. See also Milik 1976: 113–14; Orlov 2000: 27 (who claims that Akhuzan is "a specific name for the hill of the Temple in Jerusalem"); 2004b: 175; 2005a: 201; Böttrich 2001: 457. For the identification of Akhuzan as Jerusalem within the text see the Christian interpolation at 2 En. 71:35–36. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations of and allusions to 2 Enoch are taken from the longer recension (J) in Andersen 1983.

230 Andersen 1983: 190–91 discusses variant readings in this verse. Orlov 2003b: 301 considers Recension A ("our sins") to be secondary.

231 In 53:1–2 it seems that nobody can help when it comes to dealing with sin, while in 59:2 the properly offered sacrifice of a clean animal for sin brings healing. VanderKam 1995a: 160 and Carlsson 2004: 85 trace the ideas to the role of the suffering servant of Isa 53, although there is little else in 2 Enoch reflecting the Servant Songs. Orlov 2003b: 299–302, following Idel 1990: 220–40, argues that the text refers to Enoch removing the primordial

his brothers construct an altar at Akhuzan, where Enoch had been taken up to heaven. They sacrifice sheep and oxen, and all the people offer sacrifices before the Lord. That the altar is built at the place where Enoch departs for the heavenly temple reflects the idea of the earthly temple as the place where heaven and earth intersect.²³² Moreover, since Enoch's exaltation to heaven precedes the eschaton when all the righteous will be gathered together "into the great age" (65:7) where they will shine seven times brighter than the sun (66:7),²³³ the vertical axis between earth and heaven and the horizontal axis between the creation and the eschaton are combined in the person of Enoch.²³⁴ By this means, the text claims antiquity and prestige for the Jerusalem temple and its cultus.

Enoch's Heavenly Journey

The superscription to 2 Enoch explains what will follow: the Lord took Enoch, a wise and skilled man, away so that he might see the highest realms, the kingdom of God almighty, the station of the Lord's servants, and the Lord's immovable throne.²³⁵ Immediately following this, in 2 En. 1, Enoch himself describes how that at the age of 365 years, he was troubled by a dream in which he saw two huge men at the end of his bed sent by God to take him to heaven.²³⁶ He gives parting instructions to his sons in 2 En. 2, and in 2 En. 3 the journey begins.²³⁷

sin of Adam by his transformation into an angel, taking over the dominion of Adam, who was created as an angel (30:11–12), while Macaskill 2007: 220–25 argues that the motif of the recovery of Adam's glory is not as "crucial and pervasive as Orlov suggests." See now Orlov's response in Orlov 2009b: 108–10.

232 Orlov 2009b: 107–8; Fletcher-Louis 2012: 132.

233 Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 155.

234 Collins 1983a: 536–37; Orlov 2009b: 108, "Enoch's eschatological role is tied to the idea of the earthly counterpart of the Throne, the earthly Temple. The vertical axis of the Throne and the Temple is thus explicitly reaffirmed in the text, as is the horizontal line connecting the protological and eschatological events."

235 Andersen 1983: 103 suggests that the immovable throne is similar to the unshakeable kingdom of Heb 12:28. Enoch's experiences in the highest heaven where he is transformed into an angel of the presence are not germane to my study and I will only deal with seven-heaven schema and with Enoch's vision of Paradise from the third heaven.

236 These "huge men" are angels (33:6) who appear to Enoch as men. For angels as men see Gen 18:2; 19:1; 2 Macc 3:26; Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10.

237 Unlike 1 En. 14 where Enoch ascends in a dream, here he is conscious and ascends bodily, culminating in physical transformation into an angel. Since he has time to inform his family (Dean-Otting 1984: 226–27), his departure is far more orderly. To return to earth he

Enoch passes through successive heavens. In the first he sees two hundred angels who govern the stars and heavenly combinations, and in the second he sees fallen angels who ask him to pray for them,²³⁸ a request he refuses since he is a human.²³⁹ From the third heaven, he looks down and sees the Paradise of Eden,²⁴⁰ with luxuriant trees, both flowering and fruit-bearing, the tree of life where God rests when he enters Paradise, and two rivers that divide into four, confirming that this is Eden (Gen 2:10). That God rests here indicates that it is a sanctuary (2 Chr 6:41).²⁴¹

The angels explain to Enoch that Paradise had been prepared for the righteous, those who live ethically proper lives, as an “eternal inheritance” (9:1). Thus, protology and eschatology are combined, with Eden being the primordial sanctuary and also the place of eschatological rest for the righteous.²⁴² The passive “has been prepared” should be read as a divine passive, suggesting that Paradise is the eschatological temple built by the Lord, as in Exod 15:17.

In the fourth heaven, Enoch sees astronomical phenomena (11–16) and armed troops of angels worshipping the Lord. Moving to the fifth heaven, he encounters the mournful Grigori (watchers).²⁴³ In 18:6–9 Enoch tells these watchers that he has prayed for those in the second heaven, but that they had

needs to have his face chilled (2 En. 37). However, he is unable to eat, indicating that he retains angelic status (2 En. 56:2). See Alexander 1998: 102–4; Orlov 2005b: 237.

238 See 1 En. 13:4–7; Heb 7:25. In 2 En. 7:5 Enoch’s response to the request that he prays for the fallen angels corresponds to God’s word to Enoch in 1 En. 15:2. See Orlov 2009b: 138–39.

239 Contrast his explanation in 18:7 to the watchers of the fifth heaven that he has prayed for their brothers in the second heaven.

240 The text reads “Edem.” See LXX Gen 2:8, 10. I follow Andersen 1983: 114–16 in capitalising Paradise as a proper noun, and I use the standard spelling of the various names that have divergent spelling (e.g. Noah is spelled Noe, and Methuselah, Methusalam). For Paradise in the third heaven see 2 Cor 12:2, 4.

241 On Paradise as part of the heavenly temple in 2 Enoch see Lee 2001: 74–76 and for the heavenly location of Paradise see Andersen 1983: 114–16 (notes b, l).

242 Puech 1993: 1: 179–80 refers to “un type d’eschatologie vertical,” suggesting that “le Grand Eon [65:8] . . . préexiste au siècle de la création et il appartient à la sphère céleste et . . . se révélera à la fin des temps.” See also Collins 1998: 245–46.

243 Andersen 1983: 130 and VanderKam 1995a: 159 suggest that Grigori is a transliteration of γρηγορέω (“to watch”). A more likely derivation is the (plural) adjective ἐγρηγόροι (“watchful”). The story of the fallen watchers is rehearsed in 2 En. 18, with explicit reference to their descent to Mt Hermon and their taking wives of the daughters of men who gave birth to giants, by whose deeds the earth was defiled. Given the positive references to the temple and to cultic activity later in the book, these events are probably to be taken at face value and not related to the defilement of the priesthood as in 1 Enoch (see chapter 4, below).

been sentenced to remain there “until heaven and earth are ended forever.”²⁴⁴ Noting the absence of any liturgy, he recommends that they start singing lest they anger God. They do so, although when their voices rise “in front of the face of the Lord” they are “piteous and touching.”²⁴⁵

The angelic liturgy is more prominent in the sixth heaven, where Enoch encounters seven groups of angels, “brilliant and very glorious,” with faces more radiant than the sun, “sweet choral singing, and every kind of glorious praise,” and archangels harmonising all existence. Here, too, are seven phoenixes,²⁴⁶ seven cherubim and seven six-winged beings, all singing in unison, “and the Lord is delighted by his footstool.”²⁴⁷

The climax of the heavenly journey is the seventh heaven, where Enoch sees God on his “exceedingly high throne” (20:3). Other features of this highest heaven are an exceptionally great light, fiery armies of the great archangels, incorporeal forces, dominions, authorities, cherubim and seraphim and many eyed thrones, shining *otanim* stations.²⁴⁸ In the long recension God appears to be in the tenth heaven called Aravoth, at the top of ten steps,²⁴⁹ where the heavenly armies stand in their ranks, doing obeisance. The angels are also

244 That he prays for the angels marks a step in the transformation of Enoch. He refuses to pray for those in the second heaven, in the fifth he sees himself as able to do this, and ultimately he is transformed into an angel (19:17–19). See Reed 2005: 103–4.

245 Himmelfarb 1993: 129–30 (note 44) suggests that these watchers are mourning their fallen colleagues in the second heaven (7:3–5) rather than their own sin. Collins 1995a: 72 refers to these as “the nonfallen Watchers.” See also VanderKam 1995a: 159. However, 18:3 seems to indicate that there are fallen angels in both the second and fifth heavens, and indeed their leader is Satanail, the name of the devil in 31:5.

246 Phoenixes appear in 12:1 as flying spirits who accompany the sun and in 15:1 they burst into song. In 19:6 they appear as angels. Dean-Otting 1984: 257 (note 11), following Turdeanu 1968: 53–54, suggests that “phoenixes” could be a corruption of the Hebrew *Ophanim*.

247 The reference to the footstool is obscure. See Ps 99:5; 110:1; Isa 66:1; Matt 5:13; Luke 20:43; Acts 2:35; 7:49; Heb 1:3; 10:13.

248 Andersen 1983: 135 refers to “[t]he difficulties experienced by Slav. scribes with these genuine Heb. words.” See also Dean-Otting 1984: 257 (note 12). *Otanim* seems to be a corruption of *Ophanim*, the wheels in Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1:15–21; 3:13; 10:6–10; 11:22, Heb אֹפָנִים), which in some texts become another class of angels. See 1 En. 61:10; 4Q403 1 II 15; 4Q405 20 II–21–22 3, 9. It is spelled correctly in 2 En. 29:3.

249 Andersen 1983: 135 (note d) notes variant readings here. While the eighth, ninth and tenth heavens do not fit the seven heaven schema, they do have Hebrew names (Muzaloth, Kukhavim and Aravoth), suggesting that they are not interpolations by the Slavic scribes. See Dean-Otting 1984: 234–35; Nickelsburg 2005: 222 (note 150); and Macaskill 2007: 299, who proposes that these references are expansions by Jewish mystics. For Aravoth as

singing “with soft and gentle voices” (20:4), presenting the liturgy to God, and the cherubim and seraphim, “six-winged and many eyed,” are singing the trisagion in words corresponding to Isa 6:3.²⁵⁰

In 1 Enoch there are two houses in heaven, one more fantastic than the other; here, the temple idea is reflected in the increasing levels of holiness of the successive heavens,²⁵¹ but even this is unclear until the sixth and seventh heavens.²⁵² More significant for this study is the description of Paradise, combining protology and eschatology with the echoes of Eden and the reference to the place of eschatological rest for the righteous, their eternal inheritance.

Conclusion

A variety of material in 2 Enoch is relevant for this study. The first part of the book describes the heavens in detail. Enoch’s view of Paradise, prepared by God for the righteous and where God rests, reflects ideas also present in Heb 3–4. The presence of liturgy in some levels of heaven indicates that in this text, roughly contemporary with Hebrews, heaven is viewed as a temple where God is enthroned in the highest heaven. Later, a positive attitude to Jerusalem and the earthly temple is portrayed, as people are encouraged to visit it and offer sacrifices. It has cosmic features, as the intersection between earth and heaven. And while there are no obvious structural correspondences between the heavenly temple and the Jerusalem temple, the seven levels of heaven reflect the seven stages of holiness surrounding the temple found in some sources.²⁵³

Conclusion

All six texts: Sirach, the Letter of Aristeas, Wisdom, Sibylline Oracles Book 3, 2 Enoch and parts of the Philonic corpus examined in this chapter reflect a

the name of the seventh heaven see b. Hag. 12b. The name seems to be derived from the Hebrew word for clouds (עֲרֵבָה), as in Ps 68:5 (MT).

250 Andersen’s English translation of the trisagion in 21:1 corresponds to both the MT and the LXX. Andersen 1983: 135 (note 2) suggests that words “many-eyed” and the trisagion are intrusions from Christian liturgy. The trisagion also appears in 1 En. 39:12, but in slightly different words from Isa 6:3.

251 On the seven-heaven schema in 2 Enoch see Mach 2000: 251.

252 Himmelfarb 1993: 38.

253 See Fletcher-Louis 2012: 131–32. See m. Kelim 1.6–9, where the land of Israel has ten degrees of holiness, encompassing the temple with seven degrees of holiness. See also Josephus, *J.W.*, 1.26; 5.227–237; *Ag. Ap.* 2.1–2, 2.105.

positive attitude to the temple. Language of imitation appears in two places. In Wis 9:8 Solomon's temple is a copy of the holy tent God had prepared from the beginning, an allusion to Exod 15:17, which in several other texts refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. Solomon's temple imitates the eschatological temple and thus anticipates it. Philo also uses the language of copy. But the tabernacle is not a copy of the heavenly temple; rather, Moses saw with his mind's eye the immaterial ideas and constructed an archetype, which Bezalel copied in building the tabernacle. In these texts the divine design of both temple and tabernacle invests them with great dignity.

The temple has cosmic features in Sirach, Philo and in 2 Enoch. Allusions to the creation narrative appear Sir 24 and 50, clarifying that it is to be understood as a microcosm of the universe, a link between heaven and earth. Different parts of the tabernacle reflect cosmic symbolism in Philo, and in 2 Enoch, Enoch's heavenly journey begins in Jerusalem. There may be a hint the temple is another world, or the high priest is from another world in Let. Aris.

On his heavenly journey, Enoch passes through seven (or perhaps ten) levels of heaven until he appears in the presence of God in the highest heaven. These levels indicate increasing levels of holiness, and the presence of angelic priests and their liturgical activity indicate that heaven is a temple.

While an eschatological temple is implied in Wisdom, in 2 Enoch the eschatological dwelling place of the righteous is Paradise, which Enoch sees on his heavenly journey. Here, eschatology reflects protology and the righteous rest in Paradise with God. Elsewhere in these texts there is no eschatological temple. This is particularly stark in Sibylline Oracles Book 3 where the second temple will replace Solomon's temple which had been destroyed, and everything will be as it was before, including the properly functioning cultic ritual.

Interestingly, all the texts discussed in this chapter have some connection with Egypt. This observation may or may not be significant, but could indicate that Jews in Egypt viewed the temple as an ideal, being too far removed from the reality to be aware of the difficulties recognised by Palestinian Jews.²⁵⁴

254 For the significance of Jerusalem and temple for Diaspora Jews see Gruen 2010: 91–94.

Temple Rejected: Temple Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Introduction

In this chapter I examine temple symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The community reflected in these documents¹ was a community without a temple.² They had apparently rejected the Jerusalem temple, considering the worship carried on there to be corrupt and “an affront to the religion of Israel.”³

- 1 On the nature of this community see Collins 2007d: 31–52. Notwithstanding the caveats of Collins, I refer to this community as the (Qumran) community, who probably hid the scrolls in the caves around Qumran. Collins appeals for a stop to this practice “despite the lure of convenience” (2009: 369, see his full discussion on pp. 351–69 and 2007c: 283–99). I recognise that this community was probably part of “a religious association spread widely throughout the land” (2009: 369) and that different theologies are reflected the various documents. I also use the term “Qumran” for convenience, noting that the community may have come from elsewhere, and also that some scrolls were discovered elsewhere around the Dead Sea. The history of the discovery of the Scrolls and the theories that led to their identification as the library of a separatist Essene community living in the nearby Qumran settlement have been told many times. For a convenient survey, together with discussions of the contents of the different caves and the major documents see Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002. Ullman-Margalit 2006 critiques of some of the methods used by the scholars who have studied the scrolls to reach their conclusions.
- 2 This claim does need to be nuanced. While the community had withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple, temple symbolism remained important. Brooke 2007: 417–34 identifies no less than ten temples at Qumran, all of which have some bearing on this study. Brooke refers to the primordial temple (i.e. the Garden of Eden), the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon’s temple, the second temple, the temple plan in the Temple Scroll, the community as a temple, Herod’s temple, the heavenly temple, the Qumran site itself as a temple and the eschatological temple. Most of these are symbolic “temples,” with temple symbolism applied in different ways and to different aspects of the life of the community. For arguments against the view that the Qumran community had turned its back on the temple in Jerusalem see Goodman 2010: 263–73.
- 3 Schiffman 1999: 267. On pp. 269–80 Schiffman documents the history of the community’s reaction to what they perceived to be the corruption of the Jerusalem temple and its worship. For similar analyses see Gärtner 1965: 16–17 and Ringgren 1995: 214–16, and for slightly more nuanced views see Nolland 1978: 55–62; Kampen 1999: 185–97; Fuglseth 2005: 219–40. The primary sources for this claim include e.g. CD IV 15–18; V 6–7; XII 1–2.

The people responded to this in a variety of ways. In some texts there is the expectation of an eschatological temple to be built by God in the last days. Sometimes this was juxtaposed with the notion that the community itself was an (interim) temple while they awaited the eschatological temple, with their cultic activity a substitute for temple worship in Jerusalem. Allied with this was the belief that their worship was somehow connected with the worship of angels, either in the heavenly temple or in their own liturgical practices, where angels were considered to be present with them in the Judean desert.⁴ Other texts refer to exalted individuals, considered to be already present in the heavenly temple, sometimes with a (high) priestly role and perhaps an angelomorphic identity.⁵

These phenomena raise questions as to the community's understanding of the heavenly temple. Did it envisage it as a structure existing in heaven, spatially separate from the earth, where angelic worship took place in God's presence, somehow corresponding to the worship that took place on earth, in this case, in their own community?⁶ Or did they understand the temple as a microcosm of the universe, heaven on earth, "in its totality,"⁷ so that worship within the community was also understood as worship in heaven?⁸ Did this understanding carry with it the implication that the community members, or a central core of them, "functioned analogically to a community of priestly angels, officiating in the innermost sanctuary of the heavenly temple," as some have maintained?⁹ If so, since angels are considered to inhabit the

4 Frennesson 1999: 26–41; Wassen 2007: 515–19. Mach 1992: 215–16 surmises that while these phenomena may have originally been connected with the Qumran community's loss of the Jerusalem cult, this is only a partial answer. These people differentiated themselves from the rest of Israel as the ones who were closest to God. Their ideas of communion grew out of this. Compare Hannah 1999: 59, "the sectarians viewed this companionship with the angels as one of the outstanding characteristics which differentiated them from those outside the sect."

5 Bauckham 2003: 79–81. Wardle 2010: 150 suggests that the Qumran community responded in three ways: they looked to a new temple, they looked to the heavenly temple and they considered that the community itself was a temple.

6 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 255 describes this understanding of the heavenly cult and heavenly beings as "qualitatively and spatially above (in a quasi-platonic sense) the real world of the Qumran community and its worshippers." He sees this understanding as mistaken.

7 Ibid.: 62–68.

8 Fletcher-Louis suggests that in temple worship "*ordinary space and time . . . are transcended because the true temple is a model of the universe which offers its entrants a transfer from earth to heaven . . .*" (ibid.: xii, italics original, see also pp. 61–68). For similar views see Patai 1967: 105–38; Lundquist 1983: 207–8; Levenson 1984: 283–98; 1985: 137–42; Barker 1991: 57–70; 1995: 8–12; Walton 2006: 113–14, 123–29.

9 Dimant 1996: 98. See also Davidson 1992: 168–70; Barker 2003: 102–45. Fletcher-Louis has argued for this at length. See Fletcher-Louis 1997b: 165–69; 1998: 369–72; 2002, *passim*.

heavenly temple, so too the members of the community, even though living in the Judean desert.¹⁰ In this case, even though there is some sort of elevation to heaven, no texts envisage a heavenly journey.

I approach the scrolls with these questions in mind. The chapter comes in three sections. I discuss texts where there is an expectation of an eschatological temple, texts where the community considered itself to be a temple, and texts where the worship of the community is in some sense associated with the worship of angels. I also note that these responses to the rejection of the Jerusalem temple are not self-contained in the individual texts, and that some texts contain evidence of more than one of these responses.

Expectation of an Eschatological Temple at Qumran

Expectation of an eschatological temple to replace the (defiled) Jerusalem temple appears in three Qumran texts, 4Q174, the Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem Scroll. The first two of these texts both contain allusions to Exod 15:17, and both anticipate the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. The third is quite different, anticipating a rebuilt temple on earth with associated sacrificial activity.

4Q Eschatological Midrash^a (4QFlorilegium, 4Q174)

Allegro assigned the *siglum* 4QFlorilegium to this scroll in 1956 when he published lines 10–13 of what is now known as Column III.¹¹ Fitzmyer considers

Charlesworth 1980: 136 suggests that “the Scrolls contain the idea that a fully initiated Essene has transcended the human level and has started to become an angel,” and suggests that this is “an elevation to angelic status and not transfiguration to an angel.” Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 109–215 gives a comprehensive assemblage of the evidence for angelomorphism in the Hebrew Bible and in other literature from Second Temple Judaism. Gieschen 1998: 169–75 discusses angelomorphic priestly figures, including Levi, Melchizedek and the priests of the Qumran literature. On pp. 173–75 he discusses the Qumran literature, referring to “a functional identity between these human priests and their heavenly counterparts” (p. 174).

10 Alexander 2006: 102–4. Alexander draws on the work of Nitzan 1994b: 163–83 and Chazon 2003. For an early statement of the view that the community members inhabit heaven with the angels see Yadin 1962: 240–42.

11 Allegro 1956: 177–78. Allegro subsequently published the complete column plus several lines from the following column (1958: 350–54), and was also responsible for the DJD edition (1968: 53–57), which was severely criticised by Strugnell 1969–71: 220–25 and needs to be read alongside Strugnell’s analysis. In what follows I use the column and line numbers assigned by Steudel (Steudel 1994: 23–29). Steudel’s column III was formerly classified as

this title to have been “ineptly chosen,”¹² but despite several alternative suggestions,¹³ it endured until 1994, when Steudel argued that it should be combined with 4QCatena^a (4Q177), and that the two scrolls were the remains of two copies of a longer document, which she designated 4Q Eschatological Midrash^{a,b}.¹⁴ One common feature of both scrolls is the expression “the last days” (אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים), suggesting to Steudel that this was the theme of the combined document.¹⁵ Given the absence of any textual overlap and the differing orthographical features, her conclusions are not proven, but the value of her work is generally accepted.¹⁶

The references to the “last days” as well as to “the Interpreter of the Law” (דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה, III 11), the “sons of light” (בְּנֵי אֹר, III 8–9), “the community” (הַיְּחִיד, III 17) indicate that it is most likely a community composition.¹⁷ The Herodian script indicates a date for this copy sometime in the second half of the first century BCE, although it may have been composed earlier.¹⁸ About 26 fragments make up five or six columns. Most of column III has been reconstructed.

Line 19 of column II through line 13 of column III quote and interpret 2 Sam 7:10–13. Line 19 of column II is lost, but Puech reconstructs the beginning

Column I (DJD V: 53), with the same line numbers. An earlier version of this material was published in Church 2013a: 343–70.

12 Fitzmyer 1997: 82.

13 Allegro 1958: 350 describes the scroll as “a collection of *midrašim* ... compiled perhaps for their common eschatological interests.” Lane 1959: 346 proposes that III 1–13 be designated a *midraš*, “understood in the Qumran rather than the rabbinic sense of the term, i.e. with the same messianic, eschatological orientation as much of the rest of their literature.” Brooke 1985: 81–83 discusses other suggested titles, and on p. 167 designates the scroll a “*Qumran Midrash*.” Campbell 2004: 37 calls it a “[t]hematic pesher.”

14 Steudel 1994: 1–2. If Steudel is correct, 4Q174 and 4Q177 are copies of different parts of an earlier document, since they are not from the same scroll and there is no overlap between them. Strugnell 1969–71: 236–37 was the first to make this suggestion.

15 Steudel 1994: 161. אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים appears in 4Q174 III 2, 12, 15, 19; 13 + 14 V 3; 4Q177 II + 10 + 26 + 9 + 20 + 27 II 10; 2 + 24 + 14 + 3 + 4 + 1 + 31 III 2, 5, 7; 12 + 131 + 15 IV 7; 131 V 6.

16 See Puech 1993: 573–91; Bockmuehl 1995: 429–30; Brooke 1995: 381–83; Collins 1995b: 315; Davies 1995: 238; VanderKam 1995b: 576–77; Lim 1998: 71–72; Campbell 2004: 53–54; Mason 2008: 104–5. I use the designation 4Q Eschatological Midrash^a for 4Q174, however, this should not be read as agreement with Steudel’s theory that 4Q174 and 4Q177 are parts of the same document.

17 Steudel 1994: 164–65.

18 Campbell 2004: 35. Brooke 2007: 426 traces the development of community’s self-understanding vis-à-vis the temple. He considers that the notion of the community as a temple was the last of three stages, and consequently he dates the composition of 4Q174 late in the first century BCE.

of a quotation of 2 Sam 10–11a which ends in III 2.¹⁹ The column interprets the Samuel text with reference to Exod 15:17–18 (line 3) and Deut 23:3 (line 4). Lines 7–9 read 2 Sam 7:11b to refer to the enemies of the community in the manner of a pesher, although without using the precise terminology. Lines 10–11 quote parts of 2 Sam 7:11c, 12b, 13b, 14a and explain this text with reference to the rebuilding of the fallen tent of David in Amos 9:11, and an allusion to the “sprout” of David.²⁰ The *vacat* in line 13 signals the start of a new section in line 14 dealing with Ps 11:1.²¹

The opening words of 2 Sam 7:10 refer to the “place” (מקום) that YHWH will establish for his people Israel, and III 1–13 are almost solely concerned with this place. It is the eschatological dwelling place of God to be established in the last days, “the sanctuary of YHWH which his hands will establish” (מקדש יהוה כוננו ידיכה, III 3).²² The “place” is also either or both of Israel’s historical temples (מקדש ישראל, III 6), now desolate,²³ which will be replaced by the sanctuary of YHWH. Finally, the “place” is an interim “sanctuary made up of people” (מקדש אדם, III 6), existing between the time of the desolation of the sanctuary of Israel and the inauguration of the eschatological sanctuary.

- 19 Puech 1993: 574, 76. Only a few letters remain of line 18 at the bottom of fragment 4, and nothing remains of line 19. Steudel 1994: 29–30 adopts Puech’s reconstruction, noting (p. 41) that “Z. 19 beinhaltet sicher den Beginn von 2 Sam 7, 10; der von E. Puech . . . ergänzte Zeilenanfang ist zwar hypothetisch, doch entspricht er formal dem zu Erwartenden und füllt gut den zur Verfügung stehenden Platz.”
- 20 The “sprout” of David could be an allusion to Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8; 6:12. For the translation “sprout” see HALOT 1033–34. As Brooke 1999: 286–87 points out, in this text the sprout of David does not build the temple as in Zech 6:12; rather, YHWH builds it in the last days.
- 21 While the scroll is a single document, I treat II 18–III 13 in isolation since what follows starts a new topic. Columns II 18–III 13 deal with the “house” of Nathan’s oracle, while the following lines apply Ps 11:1 and 2:1 to the members of the community and their enemies respectively. Skehan 1963: 121 suggests that the two parts of the scroll stand together since the discussion of 2 Sam 7 “consists of promises to David, thought of as the composer of the Psalter . . . [and] the material from 2 Sam is intended to introduce the running commentary on the Psalms.”
- 22 The allusion is to Exod 15:17. The DJD edition (DJD V, p. 53) reads מְקֹדֶשׁ אֲדָנִי . . . at the start of this line, following the MT of Exod 15:17, although BHS notes MS evidence for the reading מְקֹדֶשׁ יְהוָה. Steudel 1994: 42 inserts fragment 21 (containing the single word יהוה) into the lacuna at the start of the line (see the photograph filed inside the back cover of Steudel’s work). This reading was suspected by Strugnell 1969–71: 225 and is adopted by Puech 1993: 573–74, 77.
- 23 Dimant 1986: 174–75. Earlier Dimant proposed that it was likely to be Solomon’s temple, “the only one desolated by foreigners at the author’s time” (1984: 519). However, given the attitude to the second temple at Qumran it could refer to either or both of these temples.

The text exploits the pun on the word בית (“house”) in Nathan’s oracle, referring first to the temple that David was forbidden to build (2 Sam 7:5) and then to the dynasty that YHWH would “build” for David (2 Sam 7:11–14). Thus, the text claims that this “place” (מקום) can be the “physical sanctuary” (מקדש), the “eschatological sanctuary” (מקדש יהוה) and “a sanctuary of people” (מקדש אדם).²⁴

That the מקדש ישראל refers to one of Israel’s temples is clear from its description as having been defiled by aliens, and desolate (III 5–6). It is also clear that the מקדש יהוה is the sanctuary to be established by YHWH “at the end of days” (באחרית הימים), in which he will reign forever and ever, as Exod 15:17–18 claims.²⁵ Whether it is envisaged as heavenly or earthly is unclear.²⁶ Certain classes of people including, but not limited to, those described in Deut 23:3 will be excluded since God’s holy ones are there (בי קדושו שם, 4Q174 III 4).²⁷

24 The word מקדש (“sanctuary”) in Ps 96:6 appears as מקום (“place”) in 1 Chr 16:27. In Jer 7:12–14 מקום refers to the sanctuary at Shiloh. See Gelston 1972: 93–94. See also footnote 104 to chapter 2 (above).

25 In DJD v: 53 Allegro makes no attempt to fill a lacuna in line 3 where the construction of the מקדש יהוה is described. Brooke 1985: 99 restores [לְוֹא] [יִבְנֶה] (“he will build for himself”). Dimant 1986: 166, 168, followed by Steudel 1994: 25, 42 restores [לְוֹא] [יִבְנֶה] (“he will establish for himself”). Wise 1994: 154 restores [לְוֹא] [יִבְנוּ] (“they will establish for him”), which Steudel 1994: 42 considers to be too long for the lacuna. Examination of the image in Reynolds, Parry, Wilson and Booras 1998 confirms that Steudel is probably correct. See also Tov and Pfann 1993, fiche 74. Moreover, in Exod 15:17 it is clear that the Lord establishes this sanctuary, and no human.

26 Flusser 1959: 99–104; Dimant 1986: 185–86; García Martínez 1992: 207–8; Wise 1994: 166; Schiffman 1999: 280 envisage an earthly sanctuary. Gärtner 1965: 30–35 seems to envisage the eschatological sanctuary as the community itself. Brooke 1985: 185 suggests that it is “heaven on earth.” Puech 1993: 584 is unsure whether the future temple to be built by God is “céleste, analogique et spirituel, ou concret et matériel.”

27 For this reading see Allegro 1968: 54; Baumgarten 1977: 66; Brooke 1985: 92, 100–7; Kuhn 1994: 203. It involves reading קדושו as a plural noun with a singular suffix, written defectively, something that occurs from time to time at Qumran, see Qimron 1986: 59. Both Allegro (DJD v: 53) and Steudel 1994: 25 restore קדושי (a construct plural or a first person singular pronominal suffix). Since these words do not appear to be a quotation (with God as the speaker) it is difficult to understand how a first person suffix can be construed in a context where God is consistently referred to in the third person (Brooke 1985: 105). Steudel 1994: 31 reads a plural construct and renders the words “sondern die Heiligen des Namens (?)” (reading שם as “name” rather than “there,” although the question mark indicates she is unsure). Puech 1993: 577 similarly reads “les saints de nom.” Wise 1994: 155 reads קדושו as a singular noun with a third person singular suffix, which he translates as “his holiness” and construes the expression as part of a new sentence. God’s holy ones could be the sanctified members of the community, angels or both.

The identification of the sanctuary of people (מקדש אדם), is debated. Since this is a construct chain, any reading such as “a sanctuary amongst men”²⁸ is excluded. However, the precise force of the genitive is difficult to determine. The sanctuary of Israel (מקדש ישראל) could be a genitive of advantage, referring to the national shrine for Israel. The eschatological sanctuary (מקדש יהוה) is probably a subjective genitive, the sanctuary to be established by YHWH. For מקדש אדם a genitive of advantage (“a sanctuary for humanity”) is possible, while a subjective genitive (“a sanctuary built by a man/Adam”) is unlikely since line 6 implies that YHWH will build it for himself (לִבְנוֹת לוֹא).²⁹ It is probably best therefore to read מקדש אדם as an adjectival genitive of substance—a sanctuary consisting of people.³⁰

The מקדש ישראל is specifically said to have been “formerly” (בראישונה, 111 5) defiled, while, the imperfect tenses of all the verbs relating to the מקדש יהוה indicate that it is still future.³¹ Infinitives and a participle describe the מקדש אדם, indicating that this sanctuary, over against that of Israel in the past and the eschatological sanctuary of the future, exists in the present and is the

Allegro 1958: 351; Yadin 1959: 96; Brooke 1985: 181–83; Baumgarten 1988: 213 suggest that they are angels, referring to Deut 33:3. Davidson 1992: 281–82 argues that they are members of the Qumran community, while Puech 1993: 583–84 (note 58) argues from his understanding of 4Q511 35 1–8 that they are both angels and members of the community: “[l]es élus, des purifiés et des saints, seront associés aux anges dans le culte du temple eschatologique que la communauté préfigure et prépare dès maintenant.” See further the discussion in Gardner 2013: 161–93.

28 Yadin 1959: 96; Flusser 1959: 102; Gärtner 1965: 34–35. This reading would require an expression such as מקדש באנשים.

29 Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 185; Brooke 1985: 92; 1999: 287. Steudel 1994: 31 translates, “[u]nd er sagte, daß man ihm ein Heiligtum von Menschen bauen solle,” and Wise 1994: 155, “and he ordered that they build him a Temple of Adam.” This is possible, given that the infinitive בנות does not inflect; however, as Brooke 1996: 130–31 rightly points out this sanctuary is subsumed under the citation of Exod 15:17. An ideal sanctuary replacing the defiled מקדש ישראל is unlikely to be built by human hands.

30 For this classification see Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 152–53 (para. 9.5.3d). For this reading see Fitzmyer 1961: 314; Gärtner 1965: 34–35; Betz 1967: 101; Brooke 1985: 185; 1996: 130–33; 1999: 285–301; 2007: 427; Dimant 1986: 174–89; Schiffman 1999: 279–80; Campbell 2004: 37–38; Alexander 2006: 32, 131. Other scholars, e.g. Allegro 1958: 352; Yadin 1959: 96 (note 13); Flusser 1959: 100, 102; McKelvey 1969: 50–51; Schwartz 1979: 83–91; Wise 1994: 166 imply that both the מקדש יהוה and the מקדש אדם are physical structures.

31 Dimant 1986: 177–78. Horgan 1979: 248 claims that “passages that refer to the events of the last days generally use the imperfect tense.”

community itself,³² an “interim, temporary sanctuary which will stand until the Lord constructs the eschatological sanctuary for himself.”³³

Significantly, the expression is **מקדש אדם** rather than **מקדש איש**, a phenomenon Brooke connects with the idea of Eden as an archetypal sanctuary,³⁴ something particularly clear in Jubilees,³⁵ and also reflected in 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 7 II 14. Brooke argues that this is not just a “human temple,” but “a community summoned to live out Adam’s cultic calling in the last days.”³⁶ Brooke develops this idea in two separate essays,³⁷ suggesting that the expression is polyvalent, referring to a preliminary eschatological sanctuary in which “[a]s with Adam in Eden . . . the priesthood . . . is that of humankind itself.”³⁸

In this sanctuary “incense sacrifices” (**מקטירים**) will be offered before God, that is **מעשי תודה** (“deeds of thanksgiving,” II 7).³⁹ The language of sacrifice is metaphorical; the sacrifices consist of thanksgiving.⁴⁰ Thus the community envisaged itself as a “holy house,” and their worship as sacral worship.

32 Dimant 1986: 177–80, 188–89.

33 Brooke 1999: 287.

34 Brooke 2007: 427 argues that the text recalls “the Edenic sanctuary where Adam worshipped.”

35 For the influence of Jubilees at Qumran see Hempel 2000: 187–88, 196; Shemesh 2009: 259–60.

36 Brooke 2007: 427.

37 Brooke 1996; 1999: 285–301. Both Wise and Baumgarten had earlier made this suggestion, apparently independently (Baumgarten 1988: 212–13; Wise 1991: 131). Wise’s essay was reproduced in substantially the same form in 1994, the year in which Baumgarten published more detailed argumentation for his view (Baumgarten 1994: 8–10).

38 Brooke 1996: 132 suggests that **מקדש אדם** conveys the double sense, both of the “sanctuary of man/men” and “sanctuary of Adam,” with the term expressing “how both the proleptic last days community-sanctuary and the divinely constructed eschatological sanctuary would be places where the intention of God in creating Eden would be restored” (1999: 288–89).

39 It is debated whether this line reads **מעשי תודה** (“deeds of thanksgiving”) or **מעשי תורה** (“deeds of Torah”). For the former reading see Strugnell 1969–71: 221; Brooke 1985: 92; 2007: 427; Puech 1993: 578; Steudel 1994: 31, 44; Kuhn 1994: 202–9; Nebe 1998: 583–88. For the latter see Allegro 1958: 352; 1968: 53–54; Yadin 1959: 96; Lane 1959: 343; Dimant 1986: 169; Baumgarten 1994: 8–10. The reading **מעשי תודה** is a subtle play on the words **מעשי תורה**, in a similar vein to the expression **מקדש אדם**. Brooke 2007: 426–27 refers to the “range of wordplays” in 4Q174: “the ambiguity of the *miqdaš ‘ādām* is its reference both to the Edenic sanctuary of Adam and to the human sanctuary of the community, and the offering of deeds of thanksgiving allows for readers to see the requirement upon them of both right worship and right action.”

40 Ps 100:4 uses similar language, as do Heb 13:15–16; 1QS IX 4–5.

Lines 7–9 interpret the words of 2 Sam 7:11ab concerning rest from enemies as the end of Belial and his plans. Then after a *vacat* at the end of line 10, a new paragraph starts with the quotation of 2 Sam 7:11b–14 where YHWH promises to build a house for David, that is, the Davidic dynasty. Any indication that David's descendant (זרע, line 10) is Solomon is avoided, and the text is applied to the “last days” (אחרית הימים, line 12). It refers to the “sprout of David” (צמח דוד, line 11), a messianic figure who would stand with the Interpreter of the Law. Then, with a further twist, this messianic figure is connected with the fallen “booth” (סוכה) of David, which according to Amos 9:11 would be rebuilt.

Ever since 4Q174 was first published, scholars have noted connections with Hebrews, usually related to the appearance of 2 Sam 7:14 (4Q174 III 11) and Ps 2 (4Q174 III 18). Hebrews 1:5 juxtaposes 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7, and Ps 2:7 also appears in Heb 5:5. As Brooke maintains, “both authors were acquainted with a tradition whereby 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 belong together,”⁴¹ although I would add that the authors do different things with these texts. But there is more than this to 4Q174 and Hebrews.⁴²

1. Steudel claims that “the last days,” the last period of history, immediately prior to the time of salvation, which has already begun,⁴³ is the theme of 4QEschatological Midrash^a and ^b.⁴⁴ The same could be said of Hebrews. Hebrews 1:2 sets the eschatological tone of the book by noting that God's definitive speech to humanity in the Son who sat down at the right hand of God was uttered “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων). The exaltation of Christ “in these last days” is the perspective from which Hebrews is to be read. That the last days have already begun is even clearer in Hebrews with the addition of the demonstrative adjective οὗτος. The exalted Son has sat down “in *these* last days.”

41 Brooke 2005a: 77. See also 1985: 209–10. This connection was first noted by Bruce 1959: 80 (note 37), 1963: 221; 1990: 55. Other commentators on Hebrews who make this connection include Attridge 1989: 53; DeSilva 2000b: 96; Koester 2001: 192; Johnson 2006: 75; O'Brien 2010: 68. Allegro 1956: 177 refers to “obvious NT parallels,” but makes no reference to Hebrews.

42 See the discussion in Peeler 2014: 38–39, who notes that while the Qumran text cites Ps 2 and 2 Sam 7, only in Hebrews are the precise texts (Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14) appealed to, showing the creativity of the author.

43 Steudel 1994: 161–63. Collins 1995b: 315 disputes Steudel's understanding of the “end of days” in 4Q174, noting that some distinctive features remain in the future. Roth 1960: 52 suggests that the “End of Days” was considered to be “a process which in the eyes of the Sect had already begun and was well advanced towards its culmination.”

44 See footnote 15 (above).

2. Secondly, Heb 13:15–16 encourages the readers to offer to God “a sacrifice of praise” (θυσίαν αινέσεως), to do good deeds and to share their possessions, actions described as “sacrifices” (θυσίαι) that are pleasing to God. This language is similar to the “works of thanksgiving” of 4Q174. The language of sacrifice in both texts involves the application of temple and cultic symbolism to the worship of the respective communities.
3. The heavenly temple in Hebrews has normally been read as the archetypal temple, of which the wilderness tabernacle was a shadowy copy (Heb 8:1–5), I will argue below that it is the eschatological temple that YHWH was expected to build in the last days, in a similar way that was anticipated in 4Q174.⁴⁵ There is, however, a significant difference. While the scroll envisages an interim “temple of men” until the arrival of the last days when God will build the eschatological temple, this notion is, at best, muted in Hebrews.⁴⁶ As I note above, the eschatological temple of the last days in 4Q174 is described with verbs in the imperfect tense. In Heb 1:1–3 God has spoken (ἐλάλησεν, aorist) “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων), with the implication that the last days have now arrived and the eschatological temple is now in place. It is the true tent, which the Lord and no human has “pitched” (ἔπηξεν, aorist, Heb 8:2). Further, in 12:22–24 God’s people have already come (προσεληλύθατε, perfect tense) to the heavenly Jerusalem. The eschatological dwelling of God with his people is now established with the exaltation of Christ. There is no need for an interim sanctuary.

4Q174 looked back to the defiled temple of Israel and looked forward to the temple of YHWH still to be established, and described the community itself as an interim temple made up of people. In Hebrews the temple of Israel is marginalised, never getting a mention, although I would argue that it lurks beneath the surface in the call in 13:13 for the recipients to exit the camp and the claim of 13:14 that they have no continuing city.⁴⁷

45 I argue this in Part II, in my discussion of temple symbolism in Hebrews. For a convenient summary of the arguments see Church 2013a: 356–69.

46 Gärtner 1965: 88–99 detects the idea of the community as a temple in Heb 12:18–24. I will demonstrate in chapter 7 (below) that this is not quite correct. There, the community has proleptic access to the eschatological temple, but is not the temple itself. The idea may be lurking in the background of Heb 3:1–6, which I also discuss in chapter 7.

47 The claim of Heb 8:13 that what is obsolete and growing old is about to be destroyed (ἀφανισμός) may be a veiled reference to the destruction of the temple. For ἀφανισμός as a reference to destruction see BDAG 155. The word is a *hapax legomenon* here in the NT, but appears over fifty times in the LXX, of which eighteen are in Jeremiah, at times referring to

The presence of these ideas in both texts is evidence of a conversation about eschatological expectation in Second Temple Judaism, a conversation to which both the author of Hebrews and those who composed 4Q174 had a contribution to make.

The Temple Scroll (11QT^a)

Much of the Temple Scroll claims to be direct revelation from God concerning the design of an ideal sanctuary,⁴⁸ and the rituals to be carried out in that sanctuary, perhaps compensating for the lack of any detailed plan in the OT for Solomon's Temple.⁴⁹ The instructions in 11QT^a seem to be based on the design of the wilderness tabernacle,⁵⁰ a phenomenon Schiffman

the destruction of Jerusalem preceding the exile. This is significant given that Heb 8:8–12 is a long quote from Jeremiah. See Jer 9:10; 10:22; 12:11; 18:16; 19:8; 25:9, 11, 12; 26:19; 27:3, 13, 23; 28:26, 29, 37, 41, 62. For the word's use elsewhere in the context of the destruction of a temple see Jdt 4:1. For the place of the temple in Hebrews see Walker 1994: 39–71; Motyer 2004: 177–89, and Church 2013b: 114–28.

48 Zahn 2007: 435. Yadin 1967: 136 suggested that it was intended as direct revelation, and in 1977–1983: 1: 392 he uses the expression “a veritable Torah of the Lord.” García Martínez 1999: 438–39 nuances this view, suggesting that it represents itself as the only valid interpretation of the Mosaic Torah, as does Gäbel 2006: 54. Swanson 1995: 6–7 suggests that the author viewed his work as “interpreting biblical traditions for a new era, with the expectation of its being accepted with the same authority as that which preceded it.” Wacholder 1983: xiii–xiv, 30–32 renames the work 11QT^a on the basis of CD V 1–5 and claims that it was intended as “a rival to the Five Books of the Torah which God had handed down to Moses.” Stegemann 1988: 236 proposes that it was intended as “a supplementary Torah to the Pentateuch and on the same level as the Mosaic Torah.” However, on pp. 237–46 and in 1987: 28–35 he lists a number of arguments against 11QT^a being understood as “the specific law of the Qumran community.” He notes: (1) only two copies of the text were found, and these were in Cave 11 (1988: 237–38); (2) there are no quotations of the Temple Scroll in any other text identified as having been composed in the community (pp. 238–39); (3–4) there are differences in *halakha* and in terminology between the Temple Scroll and other community compositions (pp. 239–41); (5) there is no interest in other community compositions on the construction of the temple (pp. 241–42); (6) supposed allusions to the Temple Scroll in other community compositions can be explained in other ways (pp. 242–45). For a detailed analysis of the contents of Temple Scroll see Maier 1985: 8–19; Wise 1990a: 210–34.

49 Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 177; Swanson 1995: 225; Davies 1998: 4; Brooke 2007: 425. Zahn 2007: 435–58 argues that the Temple Scroll goes back to Sinai, and in effect usurps “the position of David's *tabnit* [1 Chr 28:11–19] implying as a result that the First Temple was fundamentally flawed from the beginning, since it did not correspond with the divine intention” (p. 450).

50 Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 178.

demonstrates with reference to the temple furnishings.⁵¹ Thus, “the author indicated that the sanctuary was to be the legitimate *successor* of the Mosaic tabernacle.”⁵² The most complete copy (11Q19) is written in Herodian script and usually dated in the latter half of the first century BCE. However, since another fragmentary copy (4Q524) is written in Hasmonean script, the composition is likely to be considerably earlier, perhaps late in the second half of the second century BCE.⁵³

Significantly, the Temple Scroll uses the word *מקדש* (“sanctuary”) rather than some other word for temple.⁵⁴ This word appears in Exod 15:17 to refer to the sanctuary that YHWH himself will build, and in Exod 25:8 to refer to the sanctuary (tabernacle) Moses is to build so that YHWH can dwell among them. The word is frequent in Leviticus and Numbers describing the tabernacle,⁵⁵ but the greatest concentration is in Ezekiel, where it appears thirty-one times,

51 Schiffman 1992: 621–34.

52 Koester 1989: 26–33. Quotation from p. 33, italics original.

53 Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 386–90. This date is generally accepted. In a fuller discussion García Martínez 1999: 440–44 assigns a date around the middle of the second century BCE, prior to the establishment of the Qumran community “in the priestly circles from which the community would later emerge” (p. 440). Wise 1990a: 189–94 reaches a similar conclusion. Aside from this, a wide variety of dates have been suggested, ranging from the fifth to the fourth century BCE (Stegemann 1988: 246–56), right up to the “particular point when the idea was conceived of preparing a document setting out plans for a new temple” (Thiering 1989: 101), which Thiering dates in the first century CE (p. 115). Ideas normally associated with the Qumran community are mostly absent from the Temple Scroll, including the sons of light and darkness, angels and the two messiahs, suggesting that it was not a community composition, see VanderKam 1994: 135. Mendels 1998: 369–78 concludes after examining the section on kingship that the king referred to is Alexander Jannaeus and that this section was composed around the beginning of the first century BCE, allowing also that other parts of the scroll may be older. Schmidt 2001: 178–79 reaches a similar conclusion, also referring to “a long and complex literary history” (p. 178).

54 *מקדש* (“sanctuary”) appears around forty times to refer to the ideal temple that the text describes. Other words used include *בית* (“house”) in XXIX 3; XXX 4; LI 14; *קודש* (“sanctuary”) in XVII 9; XXXII 12; *היכל* (“temple”/“palace”) XXX 5, 7, 8; XXXI 6, 7; XXXV 8, 10 (referring to the inner part of the temple, perhaps the holy of holies). *DSSSE* reconstructs *קודש* (“holy of holies”) in XXXV 1 and translates as “Holy of Holies,” but this line is devoid of any context, and the sense could just as well be “most holy,” the sense it has in XXXV 9. In column XXIX, *בית* appears in line 3 to refer to the ideal (interim) temple and *מקדש* appears in lines 8–9 to refer to both this temple and the eschatological temple respectively.

55 Lev 12:4; 16:33; 19:30; 20:3; 21:12; 21:23; 26:2, 31; Num 3:38; 10:21; 18:1, 29; 19:20.

describing both Solomon's temple⁵⁶ and Ezekiel's ideal temple.⁵⁷ The use of *מקדש* in 11QTemple^a indicates that these texts are in the frame, especially the two texts in Exodus and those in Ezek 37–48.⁵⁸ The Temple Scroll looks back to the eschatological sanctuary announced in Exod 15:17, the wilderness sanctuary of Exod 25:8, and anticipates the ideal, eschatological sanctuary in terms of Ezekiel's ideal temple.

The anticipation of an eschatological sanctuary is clear in XXIX 7–10,⁵⁹ although several scholars have read this pericope as referring to the sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple^a, understanding that to be the eschatological sanctuary that YHWH will establish for all time.⁶⁰ Others see a different sanctuary here, noting similarities with 1 En. 90:28–29; Jub. 1:15–17, 26–29 and 4Q174.⁶¹ On this understanding, the sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple^a is not the eschatological sanctuary; rather, it is an interim measure until YHWH himself establishes the eschatological sanctuary of Column XXIX.⁶²

56 Ezek 5:11; 7:24; 8:6; 9:6; 11:16; 21:7; 23:38, 39; 24:21; 25:3; 28:18.

57 Ezek 37:26, 28; 43:21; 44:1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15; 16; 45:3, 4, 18; 47:12; 48:8, 10, 21.

58 Wentling 1989: 67–69; Stegemann 1992: 62.

59 Many scholars refer to column XXIX as redactional. Davies 1998: 14 lists five “recurring redactional motifs” (God dwelling in the midst of Israel, God placing his name or glory on the city or sanctuary, God sanctifying his city or sanctuary, references to eternity and references to “this law”) that do not appear to have been in the author's original sources. All five motifs appear in column XXIX. Dupont-Sommer 1967: 618 suggested that the Temple Scroll may be made up of several sources, and Wilson and Wills analysed these, proposing that this pericope, which concludes the so-called festival calendar, “could be redactional” (Wilson and Wills 1982, *ibid.*: 275). Their source-critical analysis has been generally accepted, although there has been some critique of their methodology (Wise 1990a: 21–23, Callaway 1989: 150–51). If this understanding of the composition of the Temple Scroll is correct, this pericope is significant for understanding the theological perspective of the author/redactor of the scroll and his own conception of the work (see Wise 1989: 49–50; Kampen 1994: 88–89).

60 Thiering 1981: 60; Wacholder 1983: 22; Callaway 1985: 95–99; Wentling 1989: 61–63, 71; Kampen 1994: 85–97; Davies 1998: 17–18. VanderKam 1994: 135 considers this view to be “implausible.”

61 Yadin 1977–1983; García Martínez 1999: 455; Brooke 1999: 287; 2007: 425, 30; Gäbel 2006: 55.

62 Milgrom 1978: 114; Maier 1985: 86; Schiffman 1992: 621; Stegemann 1992: 161–65; Wise 1994: 163; Brooke 2007: 430; Wardle 2010: 151.

These alternative readings depend upon whether the preposition עַד in the expression יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה עַד⁶³ is read as “until” or “during” the day of creation.⁶⁴ Wacholder was the first to propose that the preposition be read as “during” rather than “until,” since he considered that it would difficult for God to say in one line that he would dwell with his people “in a newly designed sanctuary” forever and then to “limit His dwelling with them merely ‘until’ (עַד) the day of blessing.”⁶⁵ However, the text nowhere suggests that God will dwell forever with his people in the (physical) sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple^a. That sanctuary is more likely to be an interim sanctuary, before God comes to dwell with his people in the eschatological sanctuary he will establish for all time.

Along with the majority of scholars, I suggest that this pericope refers to two sanctuaries. The first is that described throughout 11QTemple^a, which God will consecrate with his glory (וְאִקְדְּשָׁהּ [אֵת מִקְדָּשִׁי בְּכְבוֹדִי, line 8), and upon which God’s glory will dwell (אֲשַׁכֵּן עָלָיו אֵת כְּבוֹדִי, line 8–9) “until the day of creation” (עַד יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה, line 9).⁶⁶ The other is the eschatological sanctuary where God will dwell with his people forever and ever (וְשָׁכַנְתִּי אִתָּמָה, lines 7–8), his sanctuary which he will create (אֲשֶׁר אֶבְרָא אֵינִי אֵת, line 9) on the day of creation and establish for himself for all time

63 Yadin 1977–1983: 129 and Maier 1985: 32 (cautiously, see p. 87) read יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה (“day of blessing”), while Qimron 1996: 44 proposes יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה (“day of creation”), a reading which Yadin includes in a footnote (Yadin 1977–1983: 354–55). Yadin’s Plates 44 (vol. 3) and 14* (vol. 3a) are inconclusive, as also the online digital image (<http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>. Accessed 16 February 2016). For the reading יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה see García Martínez 1992: 205; Wise 1994: 163–66; Spatafora 1997: 70; Davies 1998: 16; Brooke 1999: 287; 2007: 430; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 65; DSSSE 1250–51. García Martínez 1999: 455 expresses no preference for either reading. For “day of creation” see Jub. 4:26. See also Isa 66:18–24. 4Qp^sJub^a 1 7 includes the same expression, although with *plene* spelling (עַד הַחֲדָשָׁה), cf. Jub. 1:29.

64 For the former see Wacholder 1983: 21–32; Kampen 1994: 89–97, and for the latter see Yadin 1977–1983: 2: 129; Maier 1985: 99. HALOT 786, s.v. עַד, III 2 a, c. clarifies that this preposition can have both of these senses, although the editors note that the sense of “during” is rare. Puech 1993: 591 notes that rendering עַד with during “does not explain the idle repetition of *mqdšy* after ‘br’, and l. 9 becomes superfluous.”

65 Wacholder 1983: 23–34.

66 Spatafora 1997: 69–70 has the odd suggestion that this sanctuary is the Qumran community itself (the מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדָם of 4QmidrEschat^a), to be followed by the eschatological temple to be built by God himself (Col. xxix). He cites Bissoli 1994: 43 who, he says, attributes it to Wise 1989: 49–60. I cannot find this suggestion in either work.

(להכני לי כול הימים) "according to the covenant I made with Jacob at Bethel" (בברית אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית אל).

Scholars disagree as to the nature of this eschatological sanctuary. Brooke suggests that it is "heaven on earth," a sanctuary established by God himself as the "ultimate remedy for all of Israel's failed attempts at providing a place for the whole of creation in microcosm to celebrate the sovereignty of God."⁶⁷ Schiffman considers it is a temple in heaven,⁶⁸ while Stegemann considers it to be a "real temple building, perhaps like that envisaged in the Sabbath Songs, but on earth."⁶⁹

It is difficult to reach a conclusion on this, although the language seems to suggest that it is to be understood not as a physical structure on earth, but as the ultimate dwelling of God with his people in the new heaven and earth. Three factors support this understanding: (1) the echoes of Exod 15:17–18; (2) the establishment of the sanctuary on the day of creation; and (3) the allusion to the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel.

That God will "establish" (בון) this sanctuary echoes Exod 15:17 where YHWH is said to have established a sanctuary with his own hands.⁷⁰ As noted above this is text the "*locus classicus* for the expectation of the eschatological sanctuary in early Judaism."⁷¹ Along with the author of 4QmidrEschat^a the editor of 11QTemple^a anticipated an eschatological sanctuary to be built by God, where God would ultimately dwell with his people. In 11QTemple^a, however, the eschatological nature of the sanctuary is underscored with God's declaration that he will establish it on the day of creation, that is, the creation of the new heaven and earth.⁷² The reference to creation is an allusion to the Eden story, recalling the sanctuary connotations of Eden, but the imperfect tense of the verb to create (אברא) puts this day into the future, recalling such texts as Isa 65:17–18; 66:22–23, where all flesh will come to worship YHWH as in Eden, though there is no physical temple in which this worship takes place. Just as Israel's temples

67 Brooke 2007: 430.

68 Schiffman 1992: 621; 1994: 118.

69 Stegemann 1992: 164.

70 Other echoes of Exod 15:17 include the first person qal imperfect of ברא ("to create") spoken by God, and the substantive בִּקְדֵּשׁ ("sanctuary"). See Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 185; Dimant 1986: 168; Brooke 2007: 430.

71 See the discussion in chapter 1 (above). The quotation is from Dimant 1984: 519 and Schwemer 1995: 289.

72 Wise 1990b: 161; Gäbel 2006: 55, ("die universale Neuschöpfung"). Davies 1998: 16 suggests that there is no Hebrew word for "recreation," although the expression הַבְּרִיָּה הַחֲדָשָׁה conveys the idea.

had cosmic implications, symbolising the universe,⁷³ the eschatological sanctuary is the new heaven and earth where God dwells with his people.⁷⁴

The text also refers to the covenant with Jacob at Bethel. Wise has examined this reference more than once, and draws attention not only to Gen 28:13–29 and Gen 35:1–15, but also to Lev 26:42, the only OT text to mention a covenant with Jacob.⁷⁵ As he rightly notes, all three texts are integrally connected with life in the land,⁷⁶ and, although Lev 26:42 makes no mention of Bethel, the chapter does refer several times to God's dwelling with his people and to the covenant with Jacob in connection with a return from exile. Just as God promises to remember his covenant with Jacob and restore his people to his dwelling place, so too on the day of creation will God remember his covenant with Jacob and create his dwelling place with his people.⁷⁷

When making this covenant with Jacob, God reiterates the land promise to Abraham, with one significant difference: the promised territory expands to include all points of the compass, without limitation, so that all the families of the earth will be blessed in Jacob and his offspring (Gen 28:14). The day of creation is the creation of the new heaven and earth. Then, the land promised to Abraham and his descendants, and by association the eschatological temple, will spread out to encompass the whole earth and all humanity.⁷⁸

73 See the discussion of Sirach and of the writings of Philo in chapter 2 (above).

74 Barker 1989: 65 suggests that the temple complex in the Temple Scroll may have been designed to symbolise the cosmos. If so, then the future eschatological temple can be construed as the whole cosmos, renewed “on the day of creation,” an idea also found in Rev 21–22. See also Wacholder 1983: 33–40; Barker 1987: 25, 127, 236, 239–41; Davies 1998: 11–12.

75 Wise 1989: 54–60; 1990a: 161.

76 Wise 1990a: 160–61.

77 Wentling 1989: 67–69 draws attention to allusions to Ezek 37:26–28 in this text. There **מקדש** refers to the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people when he makes a covenant of peace with them after their restoration from the exile when he will dwell with them “forever” (**לעולם**).

78 Beale 2005: 103 suggests that the day of creation is “a recapitulation of the primal Edenic temple within which Adam and his seed should have carried out their commission by spreading out over the earth.” He sees three parts to the covenant with Jacob: that God would bring Jacob back, that Jacob would possess the promised land, and that Jacob's descendants would spread out to all points of the compass. He goes on to suggest that 11QT^a sees the establishment of the eschatological temple as the fulfilment of these three promises. VanderKam 1994: 133–35 discusses the connections with Jacob at Bethel and concludes that it seems certain that the covenant with Jacob at Bethel involved an eternal sanctuary, even if the other details are obscure. Gen. Rab. 69:7 makes a similar connection between Jacob and Bethel, and an eschatological temple.

The New Jerusalem Scroll

This Aramaic text⁷⁹ exists in seven fragmented copies.⁸⁰ It describes an eschatological city and temple, as well as the cultus operating therein, in a manner similar to Ezek 40–48, where a guide leads a visionary around the various parts of the temple and city and permits him to watch the priests carrying out their cultic duties.⁸¹

Although the name Jerusalem never appears, the city contains a temple, making Jerusalem the only real candidate. The size of the city, a rectangle twenty kilometres wide and twenty-eight kilometres long (4Q554 11 9–22),⁸² indicates that it belongs to the complex of traditions where the eschatological city has enormous proportions.⁸³ Thus, the description appears to be of the New Jerusalem and the new temple as the first editor of 1Q32 suggested,⁸⁴ an opinion shared by those who have subsequently considered the manuscripts.⁸⁵ It seems clear that the city and temple are eschatological entities, but whether they are envisaged as heavenly realities, or ideal or utopian earthly realities is

-
- 79 That the New Jerusalem text is composed in Aramaic and contains no terminology specific to the Qumran community indicates that it was unlikely to have been composed within the community. García Martínez 1999: 457–58 and Dimant 2007: 197–205 suggest that its origin lies in the same priestly circles that produced the Temple Scroll, prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, while Frey 2000: 807 suggests that it should be ascribed to some “apocalyptic circle,” proposing a date sometime after the third century BCE. Puech 1995: 87–102 concludes that it was composed in the Hellenistic period, at the same time as the Temple Scroll (p. 102).
- 80 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 5Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18. Chyutin 1997 claims to have comprehensively reconstructed the text, but nowhere explains his methodology, and his work has received severe criticism (Stuckenbruck 1999: 663–64; Patton 2000: 560–61; Frey 2000: 82). I use the fragment and line numbers in the various critical editions currently available, indicating the source in each case. Definitive editions of some manuscripts have not yet been published. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998: 305–9 discuss the state of 11Q18 and its contents. For details of the different manuscripts see Crawford 2000: 688–89.
- 81 Licht 1979: 45; García Martínez 1999: 449–51; Frey 2000: 800–801; Crawford 2000: 63–64.
- 82 For the conversion from the stadia (𐤒𐤌𐤕) in the manuscript to kilometres see Frey 2000: 813. Broshi 1995: 12–13 calculates the dimensions as twenty-one kilometres by thirty kilometres, an area larger than the West Bank, with space for a population of 150 million people. He also notes that the dimensions “bear very little relation to the topography and geography of Jerusalem.” For a similar judgement see Licht 1979: 58–59, and Puech 1995: 102 who refers to space for untold numbers of the elect.
- 83 Ezek 40–48; 1 En. 90:29, 36, 11QTemple LX–LXV; Rev 21:16.
- 84 Milik 1955a: 134.
- 85 Greenfield 1969: 132; García Martínez 1992: 180–213; 1999: 449–51; Broshi 1995: 9–10; Chyutin 1997: 107–12; Frey 2000: 800–801; Kugler 2000: 93–94.

unclear. Had the opening lines of any one of the manuscripts been preserved, such questions may have been able to be answered.⁸⁶

Several scholars have discussed the relationship between the New Jerusalem scroll and the Temple Scroll.⁸⁷ Both describe a city and a temple, but while some of the details correspond,⁸⁸ the differences between the two documents lead Frey to the conclusion that they are not related.⁸⁹ Rather they depend “on a more widespread tradition in addition to or expanding the text of the Torah.”⁹⁰ Nevertheless, García Martínez is probably correct when he proposes that the temple and city in the New Jerusalem text, the eschatological temple of 11QT^a Temple XXIX 9–10, the מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה of 4Q174 and the temple and cult referred to in 1QM all have the same referent.⁹¹ He concludes that just as

-
- 86 Milik 1962: 185 describes column 1 of the large fragment of 4QNew Jerusalem (4Q554), which starts with a description of the gates as “probablement la première colonne du manuscrit.” Wise 1990a: 65 suggests that the description moves from the outside in. Puech 1995: 88–89 suggests that 4Q554 and 5Q15 are early columns. See also Puech’s discussion in 2009: 91.
- 87 Broshi 1995: 10–11. Wacholder 1983: 96 suggests that the New Jerusalem text is dependent on the Temple Scroll, and Wise 1990a: 64–84 argues from a comparison of the two texts that the New Jerusalem text is closely related to the so-called “temple source” of the Temple Scroll.
- 88 Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 216, 220, 225–26 lists common elements between the Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem text.
- 89 Frey 2000: 805–7. On pp. 805–6 Frey lists the formal differences between the two texts. Licht 1979: 46 finds the New Jerusalem text unhelpful for clarifying the obscurities in the Temple Scroll since “it is concerned with contingent, but not identical subjects.” The Temple Scroll starts from the inside and works out, is legislation, is revealed to Moses, draws on the Torah and describes a square structure; the New Jerusalem text starts from the outside and works in, is descriptive rather than legislative, is mediated by an angel, draws on Ezek 40–48 and describes a rectangular structure.
- 90 Frey 2000: 807. García Martínez 1992: 183 suggests that only structures or rituals common to both the New Jerusalem text and the Temple Scroll and not elsewhere attested could establish a “programmatic” relationship between them. One such instance is the agreement in the order of the gates in both texts, which differs from that in Ezekiel, although the same order also appears in 4QReworked Pentateuch^c (4Q365a), which Crawford 1985: 269 and García Martínez 1992: 185 suggest may either be shorter recension of 11QT^a Temple or a source for it. Yadin 1977–1983: 1: 20 (see also vol. 3, Plates 38* and 40*) identified this MS along with 4Q364, 4Q366 and 4Q367 as part of the Temple Scroll, although Stegemann 1988: 237 shows this to be unlikely.
- 91 García Martínez 1999: 455. On pp. 450–51 he argues for the significance of 4Q554 2 III (?) 14–22, where the enemies of Israel are said to no longer harm them, and relates this to the eschatological battle of 1QM. He also notes that the city described in the New Jerusalem text is devoid of inhabitants apart from officiating priests, indicating that it is not yet

Ezekiel's visionary temple was an ideal temple to be constructed after the exile, the city and temple of this text "comprise a blueprint of the celestial model in the hope that this will be constructed on the earth in the future."⁹² The sacrificial activity proposed for the temple of the New Jerusalem text (11Q18 21–29) confirms this judgement, since it is difficult to conceive of animal sacrifice in heaven, but quite conceivable in a renewed cultus in a new temple and city in the eschaton.

The Community as a Temple

The notion of the community as a temple surfaces in 4Q174, where it is the interim temple, the *מקדש אדם*, in place until the establishment of the eschatological temple. The notion also appears in several other texts, although in these its interim nature is not in the frame. Here I discuss the Community Rule (1QS), the Rule of the Congregation, the War Scroll and 4QInstruction.

The Community Rule (1QS)

The Community Rule (Manual of Discipline) is a composite document regulating the life of the community and giving a theological rationale for the regulations. The most complete copy (1QS) is early, and perhaps predates the settlement of Qumran.⁹³ Several other copies were probably transcribed between the late second century BCE and the mid first century CE, indicating that it was a living document during this period, although some copies that were transcribed later seem to reflect an earlier version.⁹⁴ This is disputed

established. Puech 1993: 592–95 posits some connection with the eschatological battle from this fragment, but notes that the state of the text means that this cannot be elaborated further. See also Crawford 2000: 74.

92 García Martínez 1999: 453. See also 1992: 201, 207–11; Wise 2000: 744; Fuller Dow 2010: 135.

93 Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 2.

94 Gagnon 1992: 61–79; Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 2; Metso 1997: 69–106, esp. 105–6; Nickelsburg 2005: 137–38; Mason 2008: 83–84; Lucas 2010: 30–52. 1QS was probably copied from a defective exemplar as it contains numerous blanks and other corrections (Dimant 1984: 498). In what follows, I refer to the text in Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b, and *DSSSE*. 1QS is normally used as a point of reference (Metso 1997: 13), but all the witnesses to the text need to be considered. Other copies were found in caves four and five (4Q255, 4Q256, 4Q257, 4Q258, 4Q259, 4Q260, 4Q261, 4Q262, 4Q263, 4Q264, 5Q11) with a variety of different text forms, and a tiny fragment was found in Cave eleven (11Q29). For this list see Metso 2007: 3–6, and for the Cave eleven fragment see Tigheelaar 2000b: 285–92. Metso discusses other texts related to the Community Rule on pp. 51–62. Some

by some scholars who prefer to follow the palaeographical dates of the various documents, asking the question why earlier versions of a document would continue to be copied.⁹⁵ Schofield, building on Collins's insight, also reached independently by herself, that the *Yahad* was not necessarily limited to Qumran alone, argues that those documents that are dated earlier may preserve traditions from elsewhere than Qumran.⁹⁶ Thus, Schofield argues for a hypothesis where "both time *and* space [location] better explains the continuity and diversity among textual traditions."⁹⁷

The Community Rule (1QS) falls into two major parts: columns I–IV contain matters of principle and V–XI organisational detail. Temple symbolism appears in several places in the second part.

1QS V 1–6

Columns V–VI contain regulations for those who volunteer to join the community (V 1), submitting to the authority of the Zadokite priests (V 2).⁹⁸ In lines 3–5 they are required to order their lives correctly, with the outcome of this expressed in a series of infinitive constructs (lines 5–7),⁹⁹ including "making expiation for all who volunteer to be the sanctuary in Aaron and the house of truth in Israel" for those who join themselves to the community (לכפר בִּישְׂרָאֵל, line 6). Those who join the

of the copies show that deliberate, redactional changes were introduced (Alexander 1996: 437 and *passim*; Hempel 2010: 193–208). For a history of scholarship on the development of the text of the Community Rule see Metso 1997: 6–11, and for descriptions of the various manuscripts see Alexander 1996: 438–47, and Metso 1997: 13–68.

95 Alexander 1996: 437–56; Garnet 1997: 67–78.

96 Schofield 2008: 97–99. See Collins 2006: 81–96.

97 Schofield 2008: 103.

98 This section is the start of 4QS^d, and Metso 2007: 9 suggests that "the 'Rule' as such originally started at this point" with the first four columns of 1QS added by way of introduction.

99 Wernberg-Møller 1957: 28 and Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 21 translate the infinitive constructs in lines 5 and 6 as indicatives, reading words לִישְׂרָאֵל אֵמֶת מוֹסֵד in line 5 as "they shall lay a foundation of truth for Israel" and לִכְפֹּר in line 6 as "they shall atone." For the use of infinitive constructs as indicatives at Qumran, see Qimron 1986: 70–72; Knibb 1987: 104, and for *lamed* plus an infinitive functioning as a main verb see Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 611. Metso 1998: 229 and DSSSE 81 translate the first of these with "so that" and the second as an indicative ("they shall make atonement"). It is better to read both as describing the outcome of the formation of the community (expressed in lines 1–2). Garnet 1997: 70 critiques readings of these infinitive constructs as main verbs as "unfortunate," since they give the impression that "the rule promised in A is already being delivered in the B section."

community are understood to form the nucleus of a renewed Israel.¹⁰⁰ However, rather than offering sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple, they make expiation for those who join the community by their holy way of life.¹⁰¹ Moreover, they replace the temple by becoming “the sanctuary in Aaron” (לְקוֹדֶשׁ בְּאַהֲרֹן), line 6) and “the house of truth in Israel” (לְבֵית הָאֱמֶת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל).¹⁰²

A shorter version of this material appears in the badly damaged fragment 4QS^b 5 5–6, IX 5–6, and in 4QS^d 1 I 4–5. Neither of these manuscripts refer to the community members having an atoning function, and the expression “house of truth” is indefinite (בֵּית אֱמֶת) and exists *for* Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) rather than *in* Israel (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל).¹⁰³ These manuscripts could reflect a time or a community where the community itself was understood as a temple, with its atoning function not yet formulated. Moreover, since the Zadokite priests are not mentioned in 4QS^b and 4QS^d, these versions of the Rule could come from a community without such a priest,¹⁰⁴ or from a time before the status of the Zadokite priests had developed to the degree reflected in the traditions preserved in 1QS.¹⁰⁵

This community had withdrawn from the temple because of the corrupt priesthood. The members considered that they had replaced the temple by becoming a temple themselves and by performing the atoning functions of the priests in the temple for priesthood and laity alike.

100 Leaney 1966: 167–68; Wernberg-Møller 1957: 93; Metso 1997: 79.

101 In 1QS II 8; XI 14 God is the subject of כָּפַר, while here it is the community members. For other uses of כָּפַר see 1QS III 6, 8 (both passives, with the unstated agent either God or the community); VIII 6, 10 (the community atones for the land); and IX 4 (the community atones for guilt without animal sacrifice). See also CD II 5; IV 6–7, 9–10, XX 34 (all with God as subject). In 1QS V 5–6 the priests make atonement for the community, but in VIII 10 the community itself atones for the land (Brooke 1996: 124–25).

102 I have translated the expression לְקוֹדֶשׁ בְּאַהֲרֹן וּלְבֵית הָאֱמֶת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל with definite articles, as it comprises two construct chains, the first being definite through the proper name Aaron and the second through the definite article attached to אֱמֶת (“truth”). קוֹדֶשׁ (“sanctuary”) could be translated “holiness” (Leaney 1966: 161; Knibb 1987: 107). However, the parallel expression בֵּית הָאֱמֶת (“house of truth”) makes it more likely that the sense is “sanctuary” (Wernberg-Møller 1957: 93–94).

103 See Qimron and Charlesworth 1994a: 63, 73; Metso 1998: 219. These manuscripts are dated in the second half of the first century BCE (Metso 1997: 22, 36–37), maybe between 30–1 BCE (see Cross 1994: 57) which is later than 1QS, although Metso suggests that they are “undoubtedly more original” copies of an older exemplar (something suggested and discounted by Garnet 1997: 68–79).

104 Schofield 2008: 119.

105 Brooke 1996: 126–27, see also Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 19 (note 84).

1QS VIII 1–16a; IX 3–11

1QS VIII 1–IX 25 contain regulations for the founding of the community council (עצת היחד, VIII 1, 5)¹⁰⁶ in two parts, separated by penal codes (VIII 16b–IX 2). The temple that appears in Column v is explicit and is further elaborated in VIII 5–12 and IX 3–6. Here, the community is described as “a holy house for Israel” (בית קודש לישראל, VIII 5), “the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron” (סוד קודש קודשים לאהרון, VIII 5–6), “a most holy dwelling for Aaron” (מזון קודש קודשים לאהרון, VIII 8–9), and “a house of perfection and truth in Israel” (בית תמים ואמת בישראל, VIII 9).¹⁰⁷ The distinction between Israel and Aaron indicates an inner core of priestly members of the community, although all functioned in similar ways as the cultic metaphors in the following lines indicate.

While they are “to make expiation for the land” (לכפר בעד הארץ, VIII 6, 10) and “to offer a pleasant aroma” (לקריב ריח נוחח, VIII 9), these functions are connected not with animal sacrifice, but with perfect lives.¹⁰⁸ As they live like this, God is pleased and the land atoned for. Thus, the community is envisaged as a sanctuary, taking the place of the Jerusalem temple,¹⁰⁹ and the members

106 Since the following details apply to the entire community, not just to the fifteen men referred to in line 1, the expression does not refer to some body in the organisation of the community, but to the community as a whole (Wernberg-Møller 1957: 122, Worrell 1970: 71; Knibb 1987: 91, 129). The expression appears in 1QS III 2; VI 3, 10, 12–13, 14, 16, 22–23; VII 2, 22, 24; VIII 1, 5 22; XI 8, and a similar expression in VIII 11. Alexander 1996: 441 refers to “the emergence of fifteen perfect men [see 1QS VIII 1] within godless Israel, as a sort of saving remnant.” These formed the nucleus of the community, in much the same way as the Twelve formed the nucleus of the church in the NT period. In this connection I note the names of the twelve apostles on the foundations of walls of the New Jerusalem in Rev 21:14, and 4QpIsa^d 1 1–8, which reads the precious stones of Isa 54:10–11 as the founding members of the community. See Sutcliffe 1959: 134–38; Baumgarten 1976: 59–78; Draper 1988: 41–61; Beale 1999: 1071; Mathewson 2003: 497–98.

107 Following Knibb 1987: 131, I have taken the ל in the expressions לישראל and לאהרון as a dative of advantage: the community is made up of priests (the holy of holies) and laity (the holy house) for the sake of Israel and Aaron. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 124 claims that the ל should be translated “consisting of.” On this reading the “holy house” is equivalent to Israel and the “holy of holies and most holy dwelling” equivalent to Aaron. The description of the atoning function of the community in lines 6–7, 10 tends to favour Knibb’s reading.

108 Knibb 1987: 132.

109 Brooke 1996: 125. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 124–25; Knibb 1987: 131; Qimron and Charlesworth 1994a: 87; Charlesworth and Strawn 1996: 426–32; Brooke 1996: 129 read the word (מקדש) in 4QSe (4Q259) 1 III 1, and if correct the community would also be referred to as a sanctuary there. Metso 1997: 53 reads קדש (“holiness”) and DSSSE 530–31

are given cultic functions for the land that had been defiled.¹¹⁰ This land is, of course, the defiled land of Israel and, by implication, the “quintessence” of the land, that is, the temple.¹¹¹ The land is probably also a metonym for the inhabitants. This holy community, separated off from a defiled land and temple,¹¹² was the nucleus of the new Israel, with the purpose of purifying the bulk of the nation.¹¹³

Similar material appears in Column IX, although here polemic against temple sacrifices is added.¹¹⁴ The expiation that the community achieves for the guilt and unfaithfulness of Israel, obtaining God’s favour for the land is “without the flesh of burnt offerings and the fat of sacrifice” (מבשר עולות) (4 IX);¹¹⁵ rather, it is achieved with “the offerings of the lips”

reads לקדש (“for holiness”). PAM image 43263 in Reynolds, Parry, Wilson and Booras 1998 clearly shows the letters קדש preceded by the remains of the bottom of one preceding letter, which could either be ל or מ. As Charlesworth and Strawn 1996: 428–29 argue, the latter is preferable on orthographic and lexical grounds (the expression לקדש only appears elsewhere in 4Q216 VII 16; 2Q228 I 5, while מקדש appears almost 150 times). At the same point, 1QS VIII 11 reads קודש (“holiness,” with *plene* spelling). Brooke 1996: 129 surmises that the understanding of the community as a temple may have developed around the time of 4QS^e (50–25 BCE). On the other hand, it may reflect an earlier time or a different community. Schofield 2008: 115–16 proposes a location for 4QS^e somewhere near Jerusalem, “closer to the Temple *milieu*.” Whether this particular reading would support this view is open to question.

110 Leaney 1966: 216–19; Knibb 1987: 131.

111 Davies 1974: 152.

112 Metso 2007: 13 finds here implicit “condemnation” of the Jerusalem temple.

113 Compare Num 25:33. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 125 reads ארץ as “earth,” but this obscures the connection with the land of Israel. It is this holy land that had been polluted and that had led the community to withdraw to the desert to atone for it. For land as a metonym for its inhabitants see Zech 12:12, and see Hos 4:1–3 for the impact of injustice on the land. I am not suggesting conscious dependence on these texts on the part of the Qumran community.

114 Leaney 1966: 224–25.

115 Wernberg-Møller 1957: 133 reads the preposition מן in the phrase מבשר עולות as “by means of,” referring to Milik with no bibliographical detail. Milik 1951: 151 translates “ex carne holocaustorum et ex pinguedine hostiarum oblationis.” He argues that while the sacrificial terminology is kept, “the attitude is altogether spiritual, and there can hardly be any doubt that the religious circles behind 1QS did not practice sacrificial cult.” His translation obscures this. Moreover, there seems little justification for translating מבשר עולות with “by means of the flesh of burnt offerings” and ומחלבי זבח with “from the fat pieces of the sacrifice.” Leaney 1966: 210 translates “more than by flesh of burnt offerings or by the fat of sacrifice,” although he makes no comment on this translation. Knibb 1987 notes “some uncertainties of translation,” but gives no further detail. The text of 4QS^d

(תמים) and “right conduct as a pleasing freewill offering” (IX 4–5, תרומת שפתים) (IX 5, דרך כנדבת מנחה רצון). Words of praise and proper conduct are described with cultic metaphors, and these are sufficient to remove defilement and secure God’s favour.¹¹⁶

1QS IX 26–XI 22

The Community Rule (in 1QS) ends with a lengthy prayer ascribed to the *maskil*.¹¹⁷ In 1QS XI 5–10 it becomes clear that some members of the community considered that God had chosen them to have an inheritance “in the lot of the holy ones” (בגורל קדושים, XI 7–8) and to be united “with the sons of heaven” (line 8, בני שמים) to form the community council, although the speaker himself is not included since he belongs to evil humankind.¹¹⁸ There is, however, no ascent to a heavenly temple. The association with the angels happens within the community.¹¹⁹ Alongside this, in line 8, the community is designated as “a holy building” (מבנית קודש), that is, a “spiritual earthly temple.”¹²⁰ Thus, the

(3 15) reads slightly differently: מבשר is lost in a lacuna, the מ is omitted from מחלבי, זבח is in the plural and נדבת is added in the description of the offering of the lips to read (and gifts and freewill offerings of the lips”).

116 See Ps 51:15–17; Isa 57:18 [MT 57:19]; Hos 14:3; Pss. Sol. 15:3; Heb 13:15. The same cultic metaphors appear in the closing prayer ascribed to the *maskil* in Cols IX–XI. In IX 26 Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 43 restore a reading where the *maskil* is instructed to bless his maker (עושי) with the offering of his lips (שפתים יברכנו) (1QS IX 26). Similar expressions appear in x 6 where the *maskil* resolves to “bless God with the offering of the lips” (תרומת שפתים הברכנו) and in x 14 where he resolves to bless God with “the offering of the utterance of his lips” (תרומת מוצא שפתי).

117 The *maskil* is a technical term for a community functionary (Newsom 1985: 3; 1990b: 374, note 4, see 1QSb I 1; III 22; v 20). The term appears in the introductory rubrics of the songs in the Sabbath Songs, which Newsom translates with “By the Instructor” (1985: 93, etc.). See 4Q400 I 1; 4Q400 3 II + 5 8; 4Q401 1 2 1; 4Q402 1 1 30; 1 II 18; 4Q405 8–9 1; 20 II–21–22 6; 4Q406 1 4; 11Q17 II 1; VII 9). The role of the *maskil* was to admit candidates to the community and to regulate their lives, monitoring their holiness (Newsom 1990b: 374–80). For these functions attributed to the *maskil* see 1QS III 13–15; IX 12–X 5. The term is common in 1QS/4QS and in some layers of CD.

118 For similar ideas see 1QSa II 8–9; 1QM VII 6; 4Q400 2.

119 Nitzan 1994b:164–65. Alexander 2006:108 discusses this text under the rubric of realised eschatology, suggesting that the speaker is confident that his destiny to be part of the angelic community will ultimately be realised. There is little in the context to indicate a dichotomy between the present and the future. Those whom God chooses for such communion experience it in the present and expect it to endure throughout “all future ages” (כול קץ, line 9).

120 Gäbel 2006: 71. See also Gärtner 1965: 63–4.

encounter with angels takes place within the community, which then takes on the characteristics of a temple, the dwelling place of God on earth.

The Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)

This manuscript was written by the same scribe and originally formed part of the same scroll as 1QS.¹²¹ It is written in the hope that “all the congregation of Israel in the last days” (בֹּל עֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים) (1 1) would turn away from the wickedness of the nation and come together in the (Qumran) community under authority of the Zadokite priests.¹²² In this sense it is an inclusive document; however, when discussing the decision-making gatherings of the senior members of the community it becomes exclusive.¹²³ It debars those with defilement from participation in such gatherings, since angels were also present, requiring standards of temple purity to be maintained.¹²⁴

In 11 3–4 all those afflicted with human uncleanness are forbidden to enter “the congregation of ‘these’” (קְהֵל אֱלֹהִים).¹²⁵ In 11 4–5 those with such defilement are debarred from any “standing in the midst of the congregation” (מִמְעַד בְּתוֹךְ הָעֵדָה), and in 11 5b–9 there is a catalogue of the ways in which a person can be defiled, and thus “excluded from congregation of the men of renown” (לְהִתְיַצֵּב בְּ[תוֹךְ עֵדָה אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם]). The reason for this is given in lines 8–9: “for the holy angels are in their congregation” (כִּי בָּא מְלָאכֵי קוֹדֶשׁ בְּעֵד[תָם]).¹²⁶

The men of renown described in 1 28–11 1 include the wise, the intelligent, those learned in perfect behaviour, leaders and officials and Levites, that is,

121 Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994b: 108; Stegemann 1996: 481–87; Mason 2008: 93–95. The two documents are also related in subject matter. Pfann 2000: 515–72 has identified several papyrus fragments from Cave 4 that bear some relationship to 1QSa. These are in a cryptic alphabet and are poorly preserved, see Mason 2008: 93. For the structure see Hempel 1996: 253–54.

122 Boccaccini 1998: 154; Holtz 2009: 26. For a definition of “the last days” as the final period of history, immediately prior to the eschaton, already begun in the life of the Qumran community, see Davidson 1992: 276–77; Steudel 1994: 161; Stegemann 1996: 494.

123 Davidson 1992: 186, 278.

124 Gärtner 1965: 61; Schiffman 1985: 383–84.

125 The translation “these” is from *DSSSE* 103. The antecedent of אֱלֹהִים is presumably the men of renown (אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם) of line 2. Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994b: 114–15 read קְהֵל אֱלֹהִים as “the assembly of God” (with אֱלֹהִים being Aramaic for God). They trace the formula to Deut 23:1–3 where certain people are excluded from the assembly of יְהוָה (לֹא יָבֹאוּ בְּקִהְלֵי יְהוָה). The full expression in line 8, where those with defects are excluded from the congregation of the men of renown, makes this reading unlikely.

126 Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck (*ibid.*: 116) restore בְּעֵצ[תָם] (“in their council”), rather than בְּעֵד[תָם] (“in their congregation”). For a critique of this reading see Hempel 1996: 269.

senior members of the community.¹²⁷ When these people gather, conditions of temple purity are to be maintained because of the presence of the holy angels.¹²⁸ Schiffman argues that the regulations of 1QSa are for a community living “on the verge of the end of days”¹²⁹ and are intended as an attempt to “realize . . . the very same level of perfection and purity which was to characterize the future age.”¹³⁰ Since, the holy angels are in the congregation in the present, conditions of temple purity are to be maintained.¹³¹

The War Scroll (1QM)

The first editor of this document named it “The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness,”¹³² since it “records the rules for the conduct of the eschatological war its author expected to be waged between Israel and the nations.”¹³³ Clearly, this was no ordinary war, and to see it as such would obscure the theological nature of the work.¹³⁴ Children of light and children of darkness are theological terms,¹³⁵ and the children of light ultimately prevail because God intervenes (XVIII 1).

1QM was copied late in the first century BCE,¹³⁶ but the date of composition is debated, with some suggesting the Seleucid period and others the Roman

127 The text is influenced by Deut 1:9–18; Exod 18:13–26. See Schiffman 1989: 32–35.

128 See also 1QM VII 6; XII 7–8; CD XV 15–17 (4Q266 8 I 1–7); 4QmidrEschat^a I 4, and the discussion in Gärtner 1965: 95; Wassen 2008: 115–29.

129 See 1QSa I 1 *זוה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים* (“and this is the rule for every assembly of Israel at the end of days”). For the translation “every assembly of Israel” see Stegemann 1996: 494.

130 Schiffman 1989: 8–9; 2000: 797.

131 Schiffman 1989: 49–51 notes that “the angels are regarded as being in the assembly.” Bokser 1985: 283–84, in discussion of 1QM, suggests that the presence of the angels is a reworking of Deut 23:14 (MT 15) which excludes certain people from the camp because God is travelling (*מתהלך*) within the camp. He extrapolates from this that the Qumran community “saw themselves as a replacement for the Temple, where the divine presence would dwell until the eschaton when God will bring a New Temple” (p. 284). Wardle 2010: 161–62 sees in such texts the “inverse” of texts that refer to community participation in the heavenly liturgy.

132 Sukenik 1955: 35. The War Scroll is also preserved in six fragments from Cave 4 (4Q491–96) all copied from around 50 BCE until the beginning of the first century CE. In addition, 4Q285 and 11Q14 are almost certainly part of the War Scroll. See DSSSE 112–13; Dimant 1984: 515; Mason 2008: 99.

133 Nickelsburg 2005: 143.

134 Davidson 1992: 213–15; Wenthe 1998: 293; Harrington 2006a: 177–83.

135 Ringgren 1995: 19.

136 Dimant 1984: 515. It is a composite document, with a complex literary history which I cannot go into here. See Davies 1977: 25–124 and the discussion in Duhaime 2004: 45–53.

period.¹³⁷ The text can be divided into four distinct sections, one of which (x–xiv) contains liturgical material, providing a theological foundation for the eschatological war.¹³⁸

The War Scroll refers to angelic hosts several times.¹³⁹ Gammie argues that these references indicate a thoroughgoing spatial dualism, with angels actively participating in the battle between the members of the community and their human enemies, albeit operating not from earth but from heaven.¹⁴⁰ He further suggests that this sort of spatial dualism, is found in a variety of texts from Second Temple Judaism, including Hebrews.¹⁴¹ I suggest that Gammie has misread the War Scroll. Indeed, as Fletcher-Louis points out, it mentions no war in heaven. Rather, it rehearses a human conflict in which angels have a role to play, a phenomenon present in a variety of other texts.¹⁴² Moreover, the outcome of the war is on earth. There is nothing in the text to indicate that

137 See the discussion in Wenthe 1998: 291–92. Wenthe considers that the Kittim are Romans, as in 1QpHab and 4QpNah, and that the military configurations described in the War Scroll favour the Roman period (ibid.: 291–92, note 6). Davidson 1992: 213 refers to “the overwhelming majority opinion of scholars . . . that the War Scroll is a Qumran sectarian composition from the second century BC [the Seleucid period].” These scholars include Dimant 1984: 487–88, Stegemann 1996: 502; Collins 1998: 168–69; Davies 2006: 224.

138 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 403. On the structure and contents see Yadin 1962: 7–17; Davies 1977: 20–23; Wenthe 1998: 292, 94. There are two references to the earthly sanctuary (מקדש) in 11 3 in a discussion of temple service, and in VII 11 in a discussion of priestly roles in the war and battle garments that may not be taken into the sanctuary; and a tantalising reference to “his (God’s?) house” (ביתו) in x 18, which is devoid of any immediate context. In VII 3–7 ritual purity is required because of the presence of the holy angels in the camp. Another version of this material, omitting reference to the holy angels, is found in 4Q491 1–3.

139 1QM I 10–11; VII 6–7; XI 17; XII 1, 7; XV 14; XVII 6–7.

140 Gammie 1974: 371. Duhaime 1982: 34 claims that the War Scroll evidences a correspondence “between what happens in heaven and on earth, the two essential planes of the world.” Collins 1975: 603 refers to “the two-storey structure of the war and the intermingling of Israel with the heavenly host.” In 1998: 166–68, Collins simply refers to “the presence of angelic forces” without suggesting that there was another battle taking place in heaven. Schiffman 1989: 50–51 also refers to the “great eschatological battle . . . fought . . . both in heaven and on earth . . . a simultaneous and mutual [battle].”

141 Gammie 1974: 360–61. I will argue below that this notion is absent from Hebrews.

142 Exod 23:20; 33:2; Josh 5:13–15; 1 Kings 22:19; 2 Kings 6:17; 19:35; 2 Chr 32:21; 2 Macc 10:29–31; 11:6; 15:23; 1 En. 56:5. War in heaven is reflected in texts such as Dan 10:13, 20–21; Rev 12:7–9. Davidson 1992: 232 refers to spatial dualism between the heavenly and earthly worlds. While he finds no specific mention of a war in heaven between angels in 1QM, he argues that it is “presupposed” by a number of factors, including the exaltation of Michael (1QM XVII 8–9), the defeat of Belial and his spirits by God (1QM I 15; XIV 14; XV 13–14; XVII 5–6; XVIII 1–3) and the influence of Daniel. Davidson also notes a similar conceptual

“there are two separate, albeit interdependent, but nevertheless quite distinct worlds, the heavenly and the earthly.”¹⁴³

Column XII comprises two sections, separated by a blank line (6). Lines 1–5 contain three references to God’s dwelling place and one reference to heaven, as well as several descriptions of the beings in God’s dwelling place. Lines 1–2 refer to “the multitude of [these] holy ones in heaven” (רוב קדושים [א] לה בשמים),¹⁴⁴ “the host of angels in your (God’s) holy dwelling” (עבאות מלאכים בזבול קודשכה),¹⁴⁵ “the book (enumeration)¹⁴⁶ of the names of all their hosts in your (God’s) holy dwelling” (ספר שמות כול צבאם אתכה במעוד קודשכה),¹⁴⁷ and “the number of the righteous in your (God’s) glorious dwelling” (מ[ספר צד] קים בזבול כבודכה). Lines 1–2 also refer to “the chosen ones of the holy people” (בחירי עם קדוש), and line 4 to “the armies of your (God’s) chosen ones” (עב[אות ב] חיריכה), God’s “holy ones” (קדושיכה) and God’s “angels” (מלאכיכה), all of whom are mustered together. Finally, in line 5, “the people of the chosen ones of heaven” (עם בחירי שמים) prevail.

Lines 7–17 are silent about heaven, but the community is not alone. The speaker addresses God, noting that “the congregation of your (God’s) holy ones is amongst us” (עדת קדושיכה בתוכנו, line 7), that “the king of glory is

framework in Dan 10 and Rev 12:7–9. However, in 1QM God is an active participant in the battle, while in Daniel and Revelation, the angels are at war among themselves.

143 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 397–98.

144 Gäbel 2006: 73 transcribes כה [ל] (“to you”) rather than לה [א] (“these”) following Lohse 1986: 206. Sukenik 1955, Plate 27 shows a lacuna here, with space for one character, followed by the remains of a ל and what appears to be a ה. In Tov and Pfann 1993: Fiche 97; Reynolds, Parry, Wilson and Booras 1998; Sukenik 1955, Plate 27 the distinction between what remains of this word and the word לכה in the following line is quite clear. Sukenik did not attempt to fill the lacuna. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 429 (note 70), following Jongeling 1962: 18, 274 argues that אלה is the most likely reading since there is insufficient space for a כ between the ל and the ה. The word אלה refers back to the contents of the end of column XI, which are no longer extant (Yadin 1962: 314; Jongeling 1962: 274). Had the referent of אלה been preserved the understanding of XII 1–5 could have been considerably enhanced by clarifying the referent of “these holy ones.”

145 The expression בזבול קודשכה appears in Isa 63:15 alongside שמים as here. It is probably not a proper name for heaven in this text as it is in 3 En. 17:3 (for the fourth heaven along with the names of six other heavens) and b. Hag. 12b (see Newsom 1985: 221).

146 DSSSE 133 reads ספר in line 2 as “book,” while Yadin 1962: 314 reads it as “enumeration.” See Ps 147:4; Isa 40:26; 1 En. 43:1–2 for God naming and enumerating the stars. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 424 renders the word with “book,” followed by a question mark. The text is ambiguous.

147 There is a typographical error in DSSSE 132 with קודשכה appearing as קושכה (XII 2).

with us together with the holy ones” (מִלֶּךְ הַכְּבוֹד אֵתָנוּ עִם קְדוּשִׁים) (line 8),¹⁴⁸ that “the army of his angels is enlisted with us” (צְבָא מְלָאכִים בִּפְקוּדֵינוּ) (line 8), that “the war hero is in our congregation” (גִּבּוֹר הַמִּלְחָמָה [מֵהָ] בְּעֵדְתָנוּ) (line 9), and that the “army of his spirits is with our steps” (צְבָא רוּחָיו עִם צַעְדֵינוּ) (line 9).

Davies recognises that in lines 1–2, while רֹב קְדוּשִׁים (“the multitude of holy ones”) might refer to humans, the parallel expression צְבָאוֹת מְלָאכִים (“the host of angels”) indicates that angels are in view.¹⁴⁹ However, this need not be the case. Indeed, קְדוּשִׁים clearly refers to humans in 1QM vi 6; x 10 and xvi 1, and while צְבָאוֹת מְלָאכִים seems to refer to angels, the text echoes Mal 2:5–7, where מְלָאךְ (“angel”) refers to the Levitical priesthood.¹⁵⁰ Thus, Fletcher-Louis argues that 1QM xii 1–2 refers to “two groups who share the same space.”¹⁵¹ This is more likely, given that lines 7–17 envisage angelic beings among the human community. Thus, lines 1–5 have angels and humans in heaven, while in 7–17 humans and angels are on earth.

At first it appears that the heavenly temple is in view in lines 1–5,¹⁵² especially with שָׁמַיִם (“heaven”) in line 1 juxtaposed with three other expressions for God’s dwelling place. However, it seems clear that the battle takes place on earth, and that Fletcher-Louis is right in his claim that these lines “do not

148 I read עִם as the preposition “with,” although reading it as “people” is also possible (Collins 1993: 315). Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435 reads it as “people” and argues that the congregation of the holy ones (line 7) and the people of the holy ones (עִם קְדוּשִׁים, line 8) refer to the members of the community. It is difficult to see how a congregation comprising people can be “amongst us.” Gärtner 1965: 98 also reads “people” and sees some alternation with the holy ones “now... the company of angels, and now the sanctified members of the community.” On this reading line 7 refers to angels and line 8 to the community. Brekelmans 1965: 323 argues for a reference to people rather than angels in this text, claiming that עִם appears not to be used of angels either in the OT or the DSS. He is probably correct. For similar expressions see 1QM x 10 (עִם קְדוּשֵׁי בְרִית), “a people of holy ones of the covenant”) and 1QH^a xix 11–12 (בְּגוֹרֵל עִם קְדוּשִׁיכֶּה), “in the lot with your holy ones”).

149 Davies 1977: 100–101; Brekelmans 1965: 321.

150 The words בְּרִית (“covenant”), שָׁלוֹם (“peace”) and חַיִּים (“life”) appear together only in Mal 2:5 and 1QM xii 3. See Fletcher-Louis 2002: 425.

151 Ibid.: 425–26. Davidson 1992: 229–30 refers to God’s army consisting of holy ones and angels in heaven and “the elect ones of the holy nation’ *on earth*” fighting together (*italics added*). However, the only reference to the earth in this column is in line 5, where God’s armies are said to destroy “the rebels of earth” (קָמֵי אֶרֶץ). While these rebels are apparently on earth (Yadin 1962: 315), all the other participants in the battle appear to be located in sacred space, i.e. “heaven on earth.”

152 Yadin 1962: 241 suggests that lines 1–4 establish that “the elect of the holy people are in heaven together with the angels before God.”

describe angels in heaven above moving in synch with the human troops on the ground below. The angels—the spirits—are among the troops in the earthly conflict and both are therefore set apart from the heavenly setting of 12:1–5.¹⁵³ That this is so is confirmed in lines 13–14 where Zion, Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are called upon to rejoice at the victory that the war hero has won and to open their gates to the wealth of the nations.

Gärtner concurs, arguing that the oscillation between the third person (lines 1–5) and first person references to the community (lines 6–9) indicates that “the community considered itself to be a dwelling place for heavenly beings” and that they “believed themselves, through the cultus, to be living a life of fellowship with heaven.” He concludes that the heavenly beings are in the midst of the community, but also in the heavenly world, suggesting “a direct link between heaven and earth, between the heavenly temple and the earthly; and further, that the earthly congregation is to some extent a reflection of the heavenly world.”¹⁵⁴

This text provides further evidence of human and angelic beings involved in the same functions, probably simultaneously on earth and in heaven, with no rigid dualism between earth and heaven.¹⁵⁵ Thus “heaven” and its inhabitants also includes the earthly space where the ultimate battle takes place. This space can be understood as a temple.

4QInstruction

There are at least six fragmentary copies of 4QInstruction.¹⁵⁶ This text contains wisdom, as well as cosmological and eschatological, material.¹⁵⁷ Most of the

¹⁵³ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435.

¹⁵⁴ Gärtner 1965: 94.

¹⁵⁵ Davies 1977: 103; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435.

¹⁵⁶ Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 1. The six manuscripts are 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q423, 1Q26. Elgvin 1995: 570–71 argues that 4Q418 comprises two copies, and Tigchelaar 2001: 15–17, 61–64 argues on the basis of palaeographical, physical and textual evidence that it comprises three copies, see his discussion in 2002b: 109–26 and also Goff 2003b: 1. The document was previously known as Sapiential Work A, and the editors of DJD 34 (p. 3) propose the title “Instruction for a Maven” (מוסר למבין). It is the longest wisdom document discovered at Qumran, comprising over four hundred poorly preserved fragments (Nickelsburg 2005: 169). The lack of distinctive Qumran themes indicates that it was probably not a community composition, although the number of copies indicates that it was an important text there. See Elgvin 1996: 133; Wold 2005: 7–19; 2008: 291; Jefferies 2008: 88–89. In what follows I use the fragment, column and line numbers in Tigchelaar 2001: 20–27, which improves on DJD XXXIV (Harrington 2006b: 122).

¹⁵⁷ Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 3; Goff 2003b: 216–32.

manuscripts are in Herodian script and can be paleographically dated to the latter half of the first century BCE.¹⁵⁸ The date of composition is considerably earlier, perhaps prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, or at least in its formative period. It was copied a number of times right up to a late stage in the history of the community.¹⁵⁹ Several parts of the text have been read as referring to angels and the relationship of the addressees to angels, but these readings have not been totally accepted by the scholarly community. It is mainly addressed in the second person singular, sometimes to a person referred to as a *mēbîn*, a word that has been interpreted in various ways.¹⁶⁰

Fragment 81 of 4Q418,¹⁶¹ claims that God has separated the addressee from every spirit of flesh (הבדילכה מכול רוח בשר, lines 1–2); that God is his portion and inheritance among all humanity (הוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם, line 3); that God has made him a holy of holies for the entire inhabited world (שמכה לקדוש קודשים [לכול] תבל, line 4); has cast his lot among the gods (ובכול [א]ל[ים] הפיל גורלכה, lines 4–5); has multiplied his glory exceedingly (בבודכה הרבה מואדה, line 5); and “made him for him (God?) a firstborn” (וישימכה לו בכור ב[...], line 5). A lacuna has obscured the rest of the sentence.

That God makes the addressee a “holy of holies” (לקדוש קודשים) for the entire inhabited world has significant temple connotations,¹⁶² especially when this expression is juxtaposed with the word בכור (“firstborn,” line 5) also referring to the addressee.¹⁶³ These two words, along with the verb שים (“to make”) appear together in 4QPrayer of Enosh (4Q369) 11 5–7, a text that

158 Goff 2003b: 1–2. 4Q423 is in a late Herodian hand and can be dated in the first half of the first century CE (Elgvin 1995: 559).

159 Elgvin 1996: 126–34; Lange 1995: 45–47; Harrington 2006b: 110–12; Goff 2007: 65–67.

160 Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 3 suggest “an expert in the making”; and Nickelsburg 2005: 169, “one who understands.” See the discussion in Tigchelaar 2000a: 62–75.

161 Most of these lines are also preserved in 4Q423 8 + 23 1–4, see Tigchelaar 2001: 143.

162 Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 305; Lange 2000: 41; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 179; Stuckenbruck 2004: 64. Tigchelaar 2001: 231 translates לקדוש קודשים with “a most holy one,” preferring to avoid the translation “holy of holies,” since “it may suggest that the addressee is being appointed as a sanctuary.” However, this may be the point of the expression. Lange 2000: 40 translates “at the holiest of the holy things,” suggesting that this expression and the allusion to Num 18:20 indicates that this fragment should be describing “the election either of Aaron or Aaronite priests.”

163 Elgvin 1996: 156; In 1998: 122 Elgvin suggests that the addressee is also called a firstborn son of God in 1Q26 3 2, but see Milik 1955f: 102, who restores יִחִיד לִבְנֵי אֱתָהּ לִי in this line, and translates “car tu es mon fils unique...” Elgvin places a small fragment containing the word בכור [in 4Q418 69 15. The editors of DJD xxxiv do not include this reading (p. 283), nor do Tigchelaar 2001: 92 and Puech 2008: 157.

Kugel suggests should be read in connection with Exod 4:22, where Israel is YHWH's firstborn son.¹⁶⁴ Given the affinities between these two texts, the indications are that the priestly figure addressed in 4Q418 represents the people of Israel as a whole. The Qumran community would have read these texts as referring to themselves, the beginning of the eschatological restoration of the community of Israel,¹⁶⁵ set apart as a temple community (a holy of holies) for the world.¹⁶⁶

Participation in the Worship of Angels

Given the common understanding of the temple encompassing heaven and earth, and the recognition that the community thought of itself in terms of a temple, at times with angels present, it can be expected that they would understand that their worship encompassed heaven and earth, and was in some way associated with the worship of angels. The major text is the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice with which I conclude the chapter, but several other documents also contain material where the angels are present with the members of the community, sometimes worshipping together. Some of these texts have been read as though the worship took place in the heavenly temple, although, as I will demonstrate in this section, in most cases the angels are present with the community on earth, as angelic priests, and the community members, or

164 Kugel 1998: 129–30. Evans 1995: 198 makes a connection with Ps 89, but Exod 4:22 seems more likely since line 1 of the same fragment refers to God distributing his inheritance (cf. Deut 32:8–9), God's eye being on that inheritance (cf. Deut 11:12), and God's glory being seen there (cf. Isa 60:1–2).

165 Elgvin 1998: 118–29. 1QS VIII 5–10 expresses similar ideas. On p. 128 Elgvin claims that the community “is not described as a spiritual temple, but in 2004: 78 he suggests, “[t]his passage abounds with symbolism of Eden and Temple, which may reflect a group that sees itself as a spiritual temple.” He does not elaborate on the details of this symbolism, and while there are several places where temple symbolism is present, his claim seems to be overstated. Given that the addressee is addressed as a “holy of holies” the suggestion that they saw themselves as a spiritual temple stands.

166 Tigchelaar 2000a: 62–75 argues that different sections of 4QInstruction are addressed to varying audiences, and in 2001: 235–36 he suggests that Fragment 81 may have been addressed to a priestly audience, perhaps the leader of a community. Given the connections with 4Q369, it seems that the addressee is a representative leader of that community with a priestly function vis-à-vis Israel and the inhabited world. Elgvin 2004: 82–84 argues on the basis that both priestly and royal language is reflected in Fragment 81 that it is symbolic language and not addressed directly to priests. This objection evaporates if we see the pericope addressed to the community with a priestly function vis-à-vis the world.

at least an inner core considered themselves to be in heaven worshipping with the angels, although there is no notion of a heavenly ascent.

Hodayot (1QH^a)

The thanksgiving hymns found at Qumran were probably composed there in the fourth quarter of the second century BCE.¹⁶⁷ While the notion of union between humans and angels appears several times in this text, I limit my comments to column XI, where it is accompanied with explicit temple symbolism.¹⁶⁸

In 1QH^a XI 20–37 an individual gives thanks to the Lord (אדוני) for his redemption “from the pit and from the Sheol of Abaddon” (משחת ומשאול אבדון) (line 20).¹⁶⁹ After this initial thanksgiving, the composition splits into two parts: the speaker delineates the outcome of his redemption in lines 21–24, and his prior state in lines 25–37. I am concerned with lines 21–24 where the individual expresses the belief that he worships with the angels in heaven, with no suggestion of a heavenly ascent.

In line 21 the speaker is grateful that he has been raised to an “everlasting height” (לרום עולם)¹⁷⁰ and can “walk about on a limitless plain” (אתהלכה במישור לאין חקר).¹⁷¹ He recognises that he has been created from dust

167 Nickelsburg 2005: 132. Dimant 1984: 523 dates all the extant manuscripts during the first century BCE. The most complete manuscript is 1QH^a. Other fragments are 1QH^b (1Q35); 4Q427, 4Q428, 4Q429, 4Q430, 4Q431, 4Q432, 4Q471b.

168 Other places in the Hodayot where there is union with angels include XIV 15–21, where the speaker is associated with the angels of the presence; XIX 13–17, where this “creature of clay” is raised up to have a part with the everlasting host of angels; and XXIII 30, which uses the term “sons of heaven,” although the manuscript is too fragmented to enable any firm conclusions to be drawn. I have not discussed the Self Glorification Hymn (4Q491c), which seems to be part of the Hodayot collection. While it is evidence of the exaltation of some individual to a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods and thus useful background to the exaltation of Christ in Hebrews, it is lacking in explicit temple symbolism.

169 The column and line numbering of 1QH^a is complex. I use the column and line numbers in DJD XL, which differ from those originally assigned in Sukenik 1955. The table in Stegemann 2003: 224–26 provides a cross reference to Sukenik’s numbering. Stegemann 2000: 272–84 tells the story of the reconstruction.

170 עולם has a temporal rather than a spatial reference (HALOT 798–99), thus its appearance here in a construct chain governed by רוֹם is odd. The sense is probably “the height of eternity,” that is, heaven. Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994a: 129 translate “to eternal heights.”

171 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 104 reads this expression as “walk in uprightness without limit.” For מִישׁוֹר with the sense of “uprightness” see HALOT 578, s.v. מִישׁוֹר, 4; Mansoor 1961: 116. Laurin 1958: 344–46 translates the expression with “I walk in complete security,” suggesting “a place whose boundaries are impossible to be determined... where there

“for an everlasting community” (לְסוֹד עוֹלָם, line 22) and can take his place with “the host of holy ones” (צְבָא קוֹדְשִׁים, line 23), with “the congregation of the sons of heaven” (עֵדָת בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם, line 23) and with “the spirits of knowledge” (רוּחוֹת דַּעַת, line 23–24), three terms all describing angels.¹⁷² Clearly, the speaker considered that his redemption had resulted in a common lot with angels, but there is no indication in the text that he becomes an angel himself. Rather, he refers to himself in line 22 as “a depraved spirit” (רוּחַ נְעוּדָה) who has been “purified” (טָהַר), in line 23 as a “man” (אִישׁ) and in line 24–25 as “a creature of clay” (יֵצֶר הַחֲמֶר).

The eternal height and the limitless plain are descriptions of heaven,¹⁷³ and the Hithpael of הִלֵּךְ (“to walk about”) confirms this, given its frequent use in sanctuary contexts in the OT.¹⁷⁴ In heaven, he walks about doing what angels do, praising the divine name as one of them.¹⁷⁵ However, while the hymn is set in the context of the eschatological battle,¹⁷⁶ it is clear that the speaker is not anticipating this exaltation to heaven in the future after his death; he experiences all this in the present, while still earthbound, as a result of his becoming part of a community “associated with the holy angels.”¹⁷⁷ There is no sense in

is complete freedom of movement.” For similar ideas see Ps 18:20 (MT); 31:9 (MT); 40:3 (MT); Isa 26:7; 1QH^a x 29. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 67 refers to “the endless plains of heaven.” The idea of a limitless plain provides an apt contrast to the confines of the pit of Sheol (Newsom 2004: 258).

172 Licht 1957: 84, 163; Kuhn 1966: 45–47, Lichtenberger 1980: 224–27; Davidson 1992: 192; Nitzan 1994c: 275; Chazon 2003: 44; Nickelsburg 2006: 189–90.

173 Delcor 1952: 375; Dupont-Sommer 1952: 72; Black 1961: 138–39.

174 The Hithpael of הִלֵּךְ is not restricted to sanctuary and cultic contexts in the OT, but this is a significant use. In Gen 3:8 God walks about in Eden; in Gen 5:22, 24 Enoch walks with God, as does Noah in Gen 6:9, Abraham in Gen 17:1; 24:40; 48:15 and Hezekiah in Isa 38:3. In Lev 26:12 YHWH walks among his people, and in Deut 23:15 he walks in the midst of the camp. In 1 Sam 2:30–35 YHWH tells Eli that he had chosen his family to walk about before him forever, but because of the wickedness of his sons he would take the priesthood from him and raise up a faithful priest who would do the same in his place. In 2 Sam 7:6–7 and its parallel text 1 Chr 17:6, YHWH claims to have walked about in a tent and a tabernacle. In Job 22:14 YHWH walks on the dome of heaven, and in Ps 26:3; 56:14 (MT); 116:9 the psalmist walks with or before God. In Ezek 1:13 the torch “walks” about the temple and in Ezek 28:14 the king of Tyre walked in the Edenic sanctuary. See Wenham 1986: 20.

175 Maier 1964: 133; Mach 1992: 213–14; Chazon 2003: 43–45; Wardle 2010: 154–55.

176 Davidson 1992: 190.

177 Holm-Nielsen 1960: 66; Davidson 1992: 192–93; Nitzan 2000: 164–65; Schuller 2000: 34. Collins 2000b: 24, writes “[t]he community at Qumran claimed to enjoy, in effect, heaven on earth (in the improbable setting of the Judean desert) by becoming companions to the angels already in this life.”

the text that this exaltation and angelic communion is other-worldly or in the future.¹⁷⁸ It is “eschatology already inaugurated.”¹⁷⁹

The Rule of Benedictions (1QSb)

This manuscript was written by the same scribe and originally formed part of the same scroll as 1QS and 1QSa.¹⁸⁰ It seems to contain four blessings, although only three opening rubrics are preserved. A blessing upon the faithful community members begins in I 1,¹⁸¹ a blessing upon the Zadokite priests begins at III 22,¹⁸² and a blessing on the prince of the congregation begins at V 20.¹⁸³ The *maskil* prays that the Lord (אדוני) would bless them “from his holy dwelling” (ממעון קודשו) (I 3), that is, the heavenly temple from where God blesses his people.¹⁸⁴

Column IV 22–V 19 seems to be a blessing on the high priest, although the opening rubric is missing.¹⁸⁵ The *maskil* claims that he has been chosen

178 Compare Laurin 1958: 347, “the author is promising equality with the angels in respect to knowledge and access to God, but strictly on the earthly sphere.”

179 Davidson 1992: 193.

180 Milik 1955d: 119; Alexander 1996: 438; Stegemann 1996: 480.

181 I use the line and column numbers in *DSSSE* 104–9.

182 The blessings pronounced upon to the faithful members of the community and the Zadokite priests (בני צדוק, III 23) uniformly use singular pronoun suffixes (יברככה אדוני, III 25, see also I 3), see Nitzan 1994c: 155–56, Stegemann 1996: 497–98. These blessings use the language of the priestly blessing of Num 6:24–27 (see Milik 1955d: 121 and *passim*; Schiffman 1989: 74–75, Abegg 2003: 91–92). In that text, while the opening words are addressed to the Israelites (בני ישראל, plural), the blessing uniformly uses a singular pronominal suffix (יברכך יהוה וישמרך, “may YHWH bless you and keep you”). Ps 128:5; 134:3 display this same phenomenon.

183 Others suggest different arrangements for 1QSb. See the convenient summary in Mason 2008: 95–99. Dimant 1984: 524 suggests three sections, and Schiffman 1989: 72–73 (following Licht 1965, in Hebrew, and not accessed) suggests several blessings addressed to various groups within the community, based on the different groups delineated in 1QSa. Nitzan 1994c: 163 and Abegg 2003: 91 also suggest that columns I–III may have contained a series of blessings addressed to different groups, some unknown. The last column ends at line 29, and most of the blessing on the prince of the congregation is no longer extant, see Milik 1955d: 120; Stegemann 1996: 496–98.

184 These words are added in a lacuna by the editors of *DSSSE* (p. 104). Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994a: 122 make no attempt to fill the lacuna. The words במעון קודש (“in the holy dwelling”) appear in IV 25. The expression refers to God’s heavenly dwelling place in Deut 26:15; Ps 68:6 (MT); 2 Chr 30:27; Jer 25:30; Zech 2:17.

185 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 151–58 argues this from the focus on the apparel of the high priest. See also Schiffman 1989: 73; Ringgren 1995: 177–78; Abegg 2003: 91. Gäbel 2006: 71 assumes

to be raised “at the head of the holy ones” (ברוש קדושים, IV 23)¹⁸⁶ and prays that he would become “as an angel of the presence in the holy dwelling” (משרת בהיכל מלכות) (IV 25), “serving in the royal temple” (משרת בהיכל מלכות, IV 25) and “casting the lot with the angels of the presence and the community council” (ומפיל גורל עם מלאכי פנים ועצת יחד, IV 26).¹⁸⁷ He prays that the high priest would be made “holy among his people” (קוד[ש] בעמו, IV 27), and a “luminary” (למאור, IV 27).¹⁸⁸ Line 28 refers to “a diadem for the holy of holies” (נזר לקודש קודשים),¹⁸⁹ and the blessing concludes with the statement that the high priest would glorify the name of God and God’s holy things (תכבד שמו וקודשיו, IV 28).¹⁹⁰

Three related issues are debated here. Scholars question whether the sense of the preposition כ (as, like) in IV 25 means that the high priest takes on an angelomorphic (or angelic) identity or whether he simply serves God “like” the angel of the presence. The second issue is whether the text refers to the present or the future; that is, whether the high priest is an eschatological priestly messiah (in the future) or whether the priests at Qumran and the high priest in particular “actually received this blessing and served as angels of the presence in the abode of holiness” in the present.¹⁹¹ The third issue relates to the identification of the holy dwelling. Is this the heavenly temple (above), the earthly temple (below), or both?

On the first issue, Gieschen argues for a “functional identity between these human priests and their heavenly counterparts,” but denies that human priests were angelomorphic.¹⁹² On the other hand, Fletcher Louis suggests that the

that the blessings in this column are a continuation of those addressed to the Zadokite priests in column III.

186 This translation from Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152, see also DJD I: 126. *DSSSE* 107 translates רוש as a plural.

187 In this text the angel of the presence is both singular (line 25) and plural (line 26).

188 The ל marks the indirect object of שים as in Mic 1:6.

189 This translation from Fletcher-Louis 2002: 155. Milik 1955d: 126 restored וישימכה (“and may he make you”) prior to the word נזר, giving a reading that Fletcher-Louis calls “non-literal,” referring to the priest himself as a diadem. Such a diadem was worn by the high priest (Exod 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9), with the words “holy to the Lord” (Exod 39:30) inscribed upon it.

190 Stuckenbruck 1995: 152–154 suggests that the referent of קודשיו in this line is “his holy place.” This is similar to the use of the neuter plural ἁγία for the sanctuary in Heb 8:2.

191 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 158.

192 Gieschen 1998: 174. The idea of a heavenly counterpart appears in the Ladder of Jacob where the angels see Jacob’s counterpart enthroned in heaven. See Rowland 1984: 504;

force of the preposition “demands a real angelic identity for the high priest.”¹⁹³ While I cannot enter this debate, I do note that the elevation of the priest to such an exalted status is important background to Hebrews, showing that, in contemporary Judaism, it was possible to envisage a human exalted to where he could be compared with the angels, making it also possible to envision Christ as a supra-angelic being.¹⁹⁴

The remaining questions revolve around the way that the community perceived the relationships between the present and the future, and between earth and heaven. Gäbel suggests that the blessings will come to pass in the eschaton when the covenant of the priesthood is renewed and that participation in angelic functions on the part of the members of the community will take place within the cult of the earthly temple.¹⁹⁵ Mason surmises that the text implies worship in the presence of God when “the distinction between

Fossum 1995: 140–41; Orlov 2007: 153–73). I discuss this and its development in later Jewish literature in chapter 5 (below).

193 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152. This issue also raises its head in Jub. 31:14 where Levi is glorified to serve in the sanctuary “as the angels of the presence and the holy ones” (trans. Wintermute 1985: 115). For the influence of Jub. 31:14 on 1QSb IV 24–35 see Hultgård 1977: 1: 38–39; Endres 1987: 160; VanderKam 1988: 352–65; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 155–58. Barker 1995: 23–24 suggests that 1QSb column IV reflects the notion that “those who led the earthly worship [at Qumran] were angels before the heavenly throne.” Brooke 2005b: 162–64 is cautiously optimistic about Fletcher-Louis’s arguments concerning angelomorphic priesthood, suggesting that “[i]t is manifestly clear, however, that the worshipping community is envisioned as participating in the worship of the angels to the point at which the distinction between the human and the divine, between community members and angels, and between heaven and earth, is blurred.”

194 Morray-Jones 1992: 22 argues that the notion of the human priesthood representing “the mediating angel . . . [is] surely the background of the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” I will argue in chapter 6 (below) that, in Hebrews, Jesus the high priest is an exalted human who has become superior to the angels (1:4–13; 2:5–9) but does not take on any angelic (or angelomorphic) status.

195 Gäbel 2006: 70–71. Milik 1955d: 127 proposed that the temple referred to was that of the New Jerusalem and on pp. 121–22, 128–29, followed by Schiffman 1989: *passim*, he argued that 1QSb related entirely to the future, considering that the blessings were for the eschatological royal and priestly messiahs. Alexander 1996: 442 suggests that 1QSb is “part of a special order of service to be enacted at the inauguration of the *eschaton*.” Schiffman 1989: 75 suggests that these blessings “represent the eschatological benedictions of the present age, which the sect believed would be recited at the dawn of the *eschaton*.” Nitzan 1994c: 141 refers to the recitation of these blessings “in the eschatological future,” as also Wardle 2010: 155.

heavenly and earthy worship has been obliterated.”¹⁹⁶ On the other hand Stegemann argues that here there are “no elements of eschatology or any connotation of the future.”¹⁹⁷

Hannah suggests that the text reflects a belief in “an angelic priesthood and cult parallel to earth,”¹⁹⁸ while Fletcher-Louis maintains that “[t]here is no ‘on earth (below) as it is in heaven (above)’ language here.”¹⁹⁹ Given the fragmented nature of the scroll it is unlikely that the issues can be resolved; however, given the identification of the community as a temple and the understanding of the temple as heaven on earth, then it seems likely that these ideas are expressed in the present, in the Judean desert, which also encompasses “heaven” and the presence of the angels.

4QBerakhot (4Q286–290)

The five copies of this document evidence belief in extensive interaction between the angelic and human worlds, as well as descriptions of the heavenly temple. The formal late Herodian hand indicates a date around 50 CE for 4Q286, 4Q287, 4Q288 and 4Q290, and between 20–50 CE for 4Q289.²⁰⁰ Several opening rubrics indicate a liturgical function, as do the closing responses, אמן אמן. There is some resemblance to 1QS I 16–II 25,²⁰¹ confirming the judgement of Milik that 4QBerakhot is a further edition of the annual ceremony of

196 Mason 2008: 99. Mason urges caution, and then imagines “a high priest who would make a sacrifice of atonement in the heavenly temple.” I find the notion of animal sacrifice in heaven nowhere in the literature of Second Temple Judaism.

197 Stegemann 1996: 500. He notes on p. 488 that there is no trace of a priestly messiah in 1QSB and argues that this document relates not to the future but to the present. Gärtner 1965: 96 also considers that relegating this text to the future is “an unnecessary limitation,” proposing that it reflects “the attitude of the present community to their cultic contacts with the heavenly world, it being a general and natural characteristic to combine and interweave present and future in this way.” Fletcher-Louis 2002: 159–60 suggests that belief in an “angelomorphic human high priesthood” was not confined to the future at Qumran, and that “even though the angelomorphic high priest is placed in the heavenly realm, this was already the sphere of life for the Qumran community members.”

198 Hannah 1999: 61. Davidson 1992: 280 detects the idea of the community as a holy temple, and proposes that “the blessing envisaged for the priests would be that they should serve God in the sectarian community on earth and on into perpetuity.”

199 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152 (italics original).

200 Nitzan 1998: 10, 50, 62, 68, 73. 4Q280, containing the same set of curses as 4Q287 7 II, bears some relationship to 4QBerakhot, but the precise nature of this relationship is debated. See Nitzan 1995: 489–90; Davila 2000: 47.

201 Nitzan 1994a: 54.

the renewal of the community's covenant,²⁰² although only God is blessed and Belial cursed. There are no extant blessings addressed to the community itself. Blessings are addressed to God in the second person singular in 4QBer^a 1–7 1, 4QBer^a 12, 4QBer^b 1–5, 4QBer^d, and in several places there are details of the structure of the heavenly temple and the beings who serve therein, as well as God's work in creation.

The blessings addressed to God are of two types: those that praise God for his work in the world, and those that Davila refers to as “‘merkavah hymns’ . . . set in the heavenly realm and sung by heavenly beings and mystics.”²⁰³ By this, he seems to mean that the members of the community (mystics) join with the heavenly beings to sing these praises as in the Sabbath Songs.²⁰⁴

4QBer^a (4Q286)

This text describes the heavenly sanctuary and refers to the angels who inhabit that sanctuary and to the blessings chanted there. Four places in the text suggest the identity of those who chant the blessings. 4QBer^a 2 a, b, c is a fragment comprising seven partially preserved lines probably containing two hymns,²⁰⁵ with the second starting with a liturgical formula in line 4, יברכו ביחד כולמה (‘all of them together will bless your holy name’).²⁰⁶ If this is a

202 Milik 1972: 135–36; Nitzan 1995: *passim*; 1998: 1; Davila 2000: 41–45. 1QS 1 18–22 requires the leaders of the community to recite God's faithfulness, his mighty works and his mercy to his people, and while there is no record there of what they are to say, Davila suggests that what remains of 4QBerakhhot may be remnants of this. Newsom 1985: 2 notes a close relationship with the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, later suggesting that 4QBerakhhot was produced under the influence of the Sabbath Songs (1990c: 181). She notes that the annual covenant renewal took place at Pentecost, which Alexander 2006: 63 dates in the same week as the eleventh Sabbath of the cycle, just prior to the climax of that cycle (assuming that the Sabbath Songs only apply to the first quarter).

203 Davila 2000: 43–45. For a discussion of the term “mysticism” see Newsom 2000a: 491–94; Alexander 2006: 7–11. The term is used to refer to a religious experience in which a person or community becomes aware of the transcendent divine presence and some union/communion with this presence. For a discussion of Jewish apocalyptic mysticism see Barnard 2012: 25–28.

204 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 477–78 suggests that these liturgical fragments should be included among those texts that are likely to have expressed “in parts now lost” the same “divine anthropology” found in the Sabbath Songs and in other texts.

205 I use the fragment, column and line numbers of 4QBerakhhot from Nitzan 1998. The state of the manuscript precludes certainty, but there appears to be blank space at the end of line 3 (see DJD XI, plate 1), indicating the beginning of a new hymn in line 4 (Davila 2000: 53).

206 Nitzan 1998: 17–18.

single hymn, “the spirits who support the sanctuary” (רוחי משאי מקדש, line 1), and “the mighty divine beings” (אלים גבורי, line 2) are probably those who sing the blessings of line 4.²⁰⁷ If the fragment comprises two hymns, then the referent of the word כולמה (“all of them”) in line 4 is unidentifiable, although כולמה ביחד (“all of them together”) may imply that the heavenly beings and the members of the earthly community chant together.²⁰⁸

Line 5 includes the words קודש קודשים, either “the holy of holies,” or “holiest holiness.” Nitzan favours the former rendering, also suggesting as an alternative “the most holy heavenly sanctuary.”²⁰⁹ If the expression refers to the holy of holies, however, and if the fragment refers to heavenly beings and members of the community chanting praises together, the referent could either be the heavenly holy of holies, or that of the earthly community understood as a temple.²¹⁰ The most that can be said is that the text may reflect temple symbolism, but the precise details are unclear.

4QBer^a 7a 1 2, 3 and 6 may give some insight into the identity of those who chant the blessings, although the text is badly damaged. Line 2 refers to “their chosen ones” (בחיירהמה), an expression best understood as a reference to the members of the community. Line 3 refers to וכול [י]דעהמה בתהלי (“all their experts in Psalms of” . . .), which is also a probable reference to members of the community.²¹¹ On the other hand, line 6 refers to סוד אלי טוהר עם כול ידעי (“the council of the Elim of purification with all those who have eternal

207 Davila 2000: 53 translates רוחי משאי מקדש “the spirits of the oracles of the sanctuary,” an expression he finds “odd.” He suggests that it refers to angels serving in the heavenly temple.

208 In the DSS, as in Biblical Hebrew, יחד functions either as a substantive (“the community”) or as an adverb (“together”), see HALOT 405–6. When combined with the preposition ב, it is either an adverbial phase of place (“in the community”), or of manner (“together”). Nitzan 1998: 17 renders כול ביחד with “together,” translating line 4 as “[all [will bless toge]ther Your holy name” (see also DSSSE 645). Davila 2000: 52 does not translate ביחד, reading the line as “[...] . . . all of them . . . Your holy name.” Here, and in 4Q286 7 1 and the reconstructed duplicate text 4Q287 5 1, it is syntactically preferable to read ביחד as an adverb of manner (Nitzan 1998: 27–28, 57). For an early discussion of the use of יחד in the Bible and the DSS see Talmon 1953: 153–40.

209 Nitzan 1998: 17. DSSSE 645 and Davila 2000: 52, 54 read “ho]ly of holies.”

210 It is difficult to decide whether this expression refers to the holy of holies or to holiest holiness. The expression is frequent in the scrolls and, as here, the referent is not always clear. Apart from 4Q392 1 9 where what appear to be heavenly beings are described as משרתי דביר (“servants of the *debir*”), the word דביר only refers the heavenly holy of holies in the Sabbath Songs.

211 Davila 2000: 58 considers that they could either be “sectarian sages” or angels, and Nitzan 1998: 26 suggests that these “are in all probability the sages of the community.”

knowledge").²¹² This is most likely a description of angels.²¹³ In this text both the humans described in lines 2 and 3, and the angels described in line 6, "bless the glorious name of God" (ולברך את שם כבודכה). While the text is too fragmentary for definite conclusions to be drawn, it may be further evidence of an understanding of the temple as encompassing both heaven and earth, with angels and humans blessing God's name together.²¹⁴

4QBer^b (4Q287)

Fragment 2 of 4Q287 preserves several lines describing what appears to be the heavenly temple and those who worship there.²¹⁵ This fragment ends with the bottom margin of a column and fragment 3 begins with the top margin, suggesting that the two fragments go together. Fragment 2, lines 1–7a pile up a number of substantives, first referring to the structure of the heavenly temple and then to those who serve there. Lines 7b–8 contain verbs indicating that those who serve will praise God in the heavenly temple (lines 9–13), and line 1 of fragment 3 ends the cycle with a closing liturgical formula. Lines 2–4 of fragment 3 describe earthly creatures who also bless God, after which the fragment breaks off.

God's "ministers" (משרת[יכה]) appear in line 12 of fragment 2 in apposition to מלאכי ("angels"). In line 13 Nitzan restores קודשכה [רוחי ("spirits of your [God's] holiness") at the start of the line, and the line closes with the expression מלאכי צדקה ("angels of your [God's] righteousness"). These serve "in their wonderful dwelling places" (במעון[ני פלאיהמה]). All these expressions describe heavenly (angelic) beings.

Line 10 seems to have other beings in view. The beginning and the end of this line have not been preserved. It contains just two words, בתמים מעשיה[מה] ("in integrity their works"),²¹⁶ with no indication of the referent of the third person plural pronoun suffix. Nitzan includes this line in her discussion of "the angelic ministers of the heavenly temple,"²¹⁷ maintaining that,

For the translation "experts" see Qimron 1995: 309–10. The sense is "knowledgeable, discerning."

²¹² Translation from Nitzan 1998: 26.

²¹³ Ibid.: 27; Davila 2000: 58.

²¹⁴ Nitzan 1994b: 175–76; Frennesson 1999: 82–83.

²¹⁵ There is partial overlap with 4QBer^a fragment 12, enabling the restoration of a few words. The last line preserves the words קדושי קדו[נים] ("holiest of the holy ones"), which Nitzan restores in 4QBer^b 3, 1. The expression קודש קודשים appears in 4QBer^b 2 5, 7.

²¹⁶ Nitzan 1998: 52 and DSSSE 649 read בתמים in this line as though it were a construct ("in the perfection of their works" (Nitzan, p. 52).

²¹⁷ Nitzan 1994b: 173; 1998: 52.

as in the Sabbath Songs, תמים is used to describe angels as well as humans.²¹⁸ The word תמים (“integrity”) refers in the OT to unblemished sacrificial offerings, to God’s character and to blameless humans.²¹⁹ It does not appear to refer to angels in any text, either in the OT or the DSS.²²⁰ If this line does refer to humans, and the previous and subsequent lines refer to angels in “the temples of your (God’s) kingdom” (היכלי מלכותכה), it seems clear again that the human community is worshipping together with the angels before God in the heavenly temple.

4QBer^d (4Q289)

Fragment 1 of 4QBer^d appears to reflect similar ideas. Again the text is badly damaged and certainty is impossible. Nitzan restores a reference to “the priest appointed at the head of the Many” (הפ[קיד ברואש הרבים]) in line 4, and a reference to “the holy [angels] within all [their congregation]” (מלאכי[הקודש]) in line 5.²²¹ In line 6 these are said “to give thanks in his (God’s) presence” (ולתודות לפניו). The “priest appointed at the head of the Many” is clearly a significant member of the community.²²² He gives thanks to God with

218 Nitzan 1998: 53 refers to Ps 101:6; 1 Kings 9:4; Prov 10:9; 20:7; 1QS VIII 10, 18, 21; IX 6, 8, 9 CD VII 5 as texts where תמים refers to humans, and 4Q403 1 I 22; 4Q404 2 3; 4Q405 13 6 where she considers it refers to angels.

219 Gen 6:9 (Noah); 17:1; Deut 18:13; 32:4 (referring to God); Josh 24:14; Judg 9:16, 19; 2 Sam 22:24, 26, 31 (referring to God); Ezek 28:15 (the king of Tyre—Fletcher-Louis 2002: 258–59 argues that its appearance here for the “*Urmensch*... suggests that it would fittingly describe humanity in its heavenly mode.”); Ps 15:2; 18:24 (MT), 26 (MT), 31 (MT, God); 37:18; 84:12 (MT); 101:6; 119:1, 80; Job 12:4; 36:4; Prov 2:21; 11:5, 20; 28:10, 18.

220 Davila 2000: 121–22; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 258, 315; Bockmuehl 1990: 158–60. This word does seem to be restricted to humans and, in particular, the community members at Qumran. See CD I 21; II 15; VII 5; XX 2, 5, 7; 1QH^a IX 38; 1QM VII 5; XIV 7; 1QS I 8; II 2; III 3, 9; IV 22; VIII 1, 9, 10, 18, 20, 21; IX 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19; 1QSa I 28; 1QSB I 2; V 22; 4Q223–224 2 I 53; 2 II 13; 4Q255 2 5; 4Q256 XVIII 2; 4Q257 III 5, 13; 4Q258 VI 5, 11; VII 3, 6, 7, 8, 9; VIII 3, 4Q259 II 10, 18; III 1; III 18; 4Q266 2 I 4, 24; 2 II 16; 3 III 6; 5 I 19; 4Q268 1 6; 4Q403 1 I 22; 4Q404 2 3; 4Q405 13 6; 4Q415 2 I + 1 II 3; 4Q418 43–45 I 9; 172 4; 4Q445 4 3; 4Q448 1 9; 4Q491 8–10 I 5; 4Q510 1 9; 4Q511 10 8; 63 III 3; 4Q525 5 11, 4Q528 1 4; 11–12 3; 11Q5 XVIII 1, 18; XXII 8; XXVII 3; 11QTemple LX 21. The form תם is applied to Jacob (Gen 25:27), to Job by God (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3) and by Job himself (Job 9:20, 21, 22). It describes a blameless person in Job 8:20; Prov 29:10.

221 Nitzan 1998: 68–70 restores מלאכי (“angels”) from 4Q289 3 2.

222 The expression appears in CD XIV 6–7; 4Q266 11: 1, 8; 4Q267 9 V 10–11, and 4Q270 7 I 16. The “many” seems to have been a term used for full members of the community, see 1QS VI 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25; VII 3, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25. 1QS VI 14 refers to the man appointed at the head of the many (האיש הפקיד ברואש הרבים), whom Leane 1966: 196 identifies with the priest at the head of the many, and 1QS VI 12 to the inspector of the

the holy angels, and also animate and inanimate creation.²²³ Nitzan suggests that “the blessings . . . are to be recited by the priests and responded to by those who enter the covenant.”²²⁴ Both of these classes of people are probably members of the community, worshipping with the angels.

To conclude, 4QBerakhot is further evidence of the worship by humans and angels together, not in a heavenly sanctuary separate from and above the earth, but on earth and in heaven simultaneously. The evidence is, however, tentative because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts.

4QDaily Prayers (4Q503)

This liturgical text contains morning and evening prayers for each day over the course of a month.²²⁵ Numerous fragments make reconstruction difficult.²²⁶ Here is evidence for the joint participation of human and angelic beings in the praise of God, apparently on earth since there is again no suggestion of a heavenly ascent.

The Hasmonean hand indicates a date around the first quarter of the first century BCE,²²⁷ indicating that this is one of the “earliest recorded liturgies for

many (המבקר על הרבים). The priest at the head of the many is distinguished from the inspector in CD XIV 6–10.

223 Alexander 2006: 62.

224 Nitzan 1995: 492. Priest 1962: 56 notes how the priests take complete charge of the covenant renewal ceremony of 1QS I 18–III 12. For connections with 4QBerakot see Milik 1972: 136; Nitzan 1994a: 45; 1995: 490 and *passim*.

225 The month is unspecified. Falk 1998: 21 suggests that allusions to Passover and Unleavened Bread in his reconstructed column VII indicate the first month of the year, the month also proposed by Baillet 1982: 105–6. Chazon 1992–93: 17–18 identifies Sabbath prayers on the fourth, eleventh, eighteenth and twenty-fifth days of the month. With a 364-day calendar the Sabbath would fall on these days in the first, fourth and seventh months of the year. Chazon 1999: 259 suggests that the liturgy is for either Nisan or Tishrei, and in 2000: 219–20 she argues for Nisan on the basis of the reference to “our deliverance” (פְּדוּתֵנוּ), see frag 1–6 III 8 in DJD VII: 106, and col VII 8 in Falk 1998: 33–34) on the fifteenth of the month, suggesting a reference to Pesach. Abegg 1999: 399 suggests either the first or the seventh month, since Pesach and Sukkot respectively are celebrated in these months and, after a comparison with 4Q317, argues for the seventh month.

226 Falk 1998: 21 refers to two hundred and twenty-five fragments, with the largest containing only about twenty-four words. He suggests that a fresh reconstruction is required (p. 29), but makes no attempt, apart from column VII (pp. 33–35). In what follows I refer to the fragment and line numbers in *DSSSE* 999–1007.

227 Baillet 1982: 105; Baumgarten 1987: 399; Falk 1998: 21.

fixed prayer times.”²²⁸ While its presence at Qumran indicates that it formed part of the resources of the community, there is some debate as to whether it originated there.²²⁹ If not, then the text is evidence that the notion of participation in the worship of angels was known elsewhere than at Qumran.²³⁰

Fragment 4, lines 7–11 contain the liturgy for evening prayer for the sixth day of the month. It begins with a rubric for a congregation (יברכו, “they shall bless”; וענו, “they shall answer”; ואמרו, “they shall say”). The congregation responds in the first person plural, with words like [אנו עם קודשי] (either, “we with the holy ones” or “we are his holy people”).²³¹ An abrupt transition closes each blessing, with the community addressed as Israel in the second person singular (ש[לום עלי]כה ישראל (“peace be upon you, Israel”). Apparently, after the opening rubric the community recited the prayers in the first person and a priest or a group of priests said the concluding blessing.²³²

228 Chazon 1994: 281. On p. 283 Chazon notes that this liturgy provides “our earliest solid evidence for the *daily* recitation of praise in unison with heavenly beings and its liturgical connection with praise for the daily renewal of the heavenly lights.” It predates any other Jewish prayer book by approximately 1,000 years (p. 277).

229 Chazon (ibid.: 281–82) and Davila 2000: 211 suggest composition outside the community, since they find no evidence of the features normally associated with texts thought to have been composed by the community. Falk 1998: 22–29 finds that it shares certain structural and stylistic features, as well as a common vocabulary, with other texts that appear to be products of the community, and “stands in sharp contrast with other liturgical prayers found at Qumran that are probably not of *Yahad* origin” (p. 28). He cautiously suggests that it should be viewed as a community composition. Nitzan 1994c: 56 notes similarities but also significant differences between the Qumran practices presupposed in this liturgy and the practices of “mainstream Judaism,” who recited the same blessings every day.

230 In 1 En. 61:10–12 the reference to “all flesh” seems to indicate that humans and angels will bless God together (in the eschaton). Since the Similitudes of Enoch were not found at Qumran, this indicates that joint human and angelic praise is a phenomenon wider than the Qumran community. Weinfeld 1983: 429 claims that the notion “that men *join the angels* in their praise is first made explicit in the writings of the Qumran sect” (emphasis original), and Instone-Brewer 2004: 59, 96 notes that 4Q503 evidences similarities to prayers known only from later synagogue liturgies.

231 For the former rendering see DSSSE 999, and for the latter see Baillet 1982: 106–7 and Davila 2000: 213. The latter reading assumes that the suffix on קודש is a third person pronominal suffix rather than the remnant of a masculine plural suffix. The photographs in DJD VII, Plate 35 are inconclusive. Fragment 11, line 3 has ואנו עם קודשו (“we, his holy people”) as the subject of the participle מרוממים (“are exulting”). Alexander 2006: 65 refers to “angelic priests and their liturgy in the heavenly temple,” and finds a hierarchy made up of these angelic priests, the luminaries (sun, moon and stars) and the earthly community, all of whom worship God together.

232 Falk 1998: 54–55.

As the liturgy progresses, another designation appears. Fragments 7–9, IV 3–4 refer to בני בריתכה ואנו (“we, the sons of your covenant”), who bless the name of God עם כול דגלי [אור] (“with all the companies of light”).²³³ And Fragments 13–16 contain three references to the holy of holies: line 8 reads [... קודש קו] דשים במרומים (“the holy of holies in the heights”); line 10 reads [... קודשים] ש בקוד ובבוד (“and glory in the holy of holies”); and line 11 refers to עדים לנו בקוד (ש) קודשים (“witnesses for us in the holy of holies”).²³⁴ The community envisages itself worshipping with angelic beings in the “holy of holies in the heights.” But, while the holy of holies is “in the heights” (במרומים), the community is on earth, envisaged as a temple, that is, “heaven on earth.” Rowland suggests with reference to 1QS XI 6–9, that “God has . . . extended the boundaries of heaven to include this haven of holiness.”²³⁵ The same phenomenon appears in this text.

Chazon refers to “striking parallels in content, language, form and function between 4Q503 and the statutory Blessing on the Luminaries”²³⁶ and suggests that “prayers from Qumran evidence a continuous liturgical tradition and probably also some fixed public worship during the two centuries prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, and not just among the Qumran sectarians.”²³⁷

Songs of the Sage (4Q510–511)

The Songs of the Sage are two copies of a set of liturgical compositions which, like the several other documents from Qumran, have some connection with

233 This translation is from *DSSSE* 998–99. Davila 2000: 214–15 renders דגלי with “divisions of,” suggesting that it relates to “units of ‘light’ and ‘night,’” and Abegg 1999: 400 calls them “flags” of light. Chazon 2003: 39 renders the expression “troops of light,” suggesting that it “serves as an epithet for angels associated with the heavenly lights.” Baillet (*DJD* VII: 108) has “les troupes de [lumière . . .].” See *HALOT* 213 for the use of this word in BH, where it also has both the sense of “standard” and “division.”

234 Chazon 2000: 223; Davila 2000: 225. Davila renders the first two expressions with “[. . . ho]ly ones on high” (line 8); “glory in holi[ness]” (line 10), eliminating a reference to the heavenly holy of holies.

235 Rowland 1982: 118.

236 For this text see b. Ber. 11b. The connection between 4Q504 and this blessing is made by Chazon 1994: 278; 1999: 257, and Schiffman 1987: 37–39, 45, who suggests that these parallels are most probably evidence of “elements common to the varieties of Judaism known from Second Temple times” (p. 45).

237 Chazon 1994: 284. See also Falk 1998: 56–57.

the *maskil*.²³⁸ They are written in Herodian script and can be dated sometime late in the first century BCE.²³⁹ The reference to the government of the community in 4Q511 2 I 9–10 indicates that they were composed within the community,²⁴⁰ apparently as some sort of defence against evil spirits.²⁴¹

Several places reflect the notion of communion with angels.²⁴² 4Q511 2 I 7–10 suggests a relationship between the earthly and heavenly communities, with the people “walking in the lot of God according to his glory, and serving him in the lot of the people of his throne” (לְהַתְּהַלֵּךְ [בְּ]גִּוְרֵי [אֱלֹהִים] לְפִי) (כְּבוֹד [וְ] לְשִׁרְתּוֹ בְּגִוְרֵי עִם כְּסֹא) in 4Q511 8 6–11 someone speaks of being both “among his (God’s) holy ones” (בְּקִדּוּשֵׁי) and “with his (God’s) holy ones,” (עִם קִדּוּשֵׁי) “giving thanks to God” (לְ[אֵל]).

Less fragmented is 4Q511 35 1–5, which suggests that God sets some apart for himself as an everlasting sanctuary. Lines 1–2a appear to be a heading for a song that ends with a *vacat* at the end of line 5. The song describes the foundation of a priesthood and its role in praising God. According to lines 2b–3 “God will select from those refined seven times and from the holy ones” (בְּמִזְקֵקִי) (שִׁבְעָה־עִתִּים וּבְקִדּוּשִׁים יְקִידִי [שֶׁ] אֱלֹהִים לוֹ) and set them apart to be “an everlasting sanctuary” (לְמִקְדָּשׁ עוֹלָמִים) for God.²⁴⁴ There appear to be two groups here:

-
- 238 The expression *לְמַשְׁכִּיל* (“to/for/by the *maskil*”) could refer to composition by the *maskil* (Baillet 1982: 215), or composed for the *maskil* to sing (Alexander 1997: 319). Alexander suggests that “the voice of the Maskil” is heard in the songs, see also Lyons and Reimer 1998: 27. The expression appears in 4Q511 2 I 1, and is restored in 4Q511 8:4. In 4Q510 1 4 the speaker announces *וְאֵנִי מַשְׁכִּיל מְשֻׁמֵּעַ* (“and I, a *maskil*, declare . . .,” trans. *DSSSE* 1029). In Isa 38:9; Hab 3:1 a *ל* in similar contexts indicates authorship.
- 239 Nitzan 1994c: 236. The two scrolls are in very poor condition and their precise relationship may never be known. Nitzan suggests that they may be two copies of one work, remnants of two parallel works or two versions of the same work. They are from different hands and there is little overlap between them.
- 240 Newsom 1990c: 184 suggests that these songs were composed “under the strong influence both of the Hodayot and the Sabbath Songs.” A close connection between these songs and the Sabbath Songs is the use of *אֱלֹהִים* as a divine epithet in 4Q511 2 I 6, 8, 10; 2 II 6; 18 II 8, 10; 19 4; 30 6; 35 2, 3; 73 2, as frequently in the Sabbath Songs.
- 241 Nitzan 1992: 53–63; 1994c: 227–72; Alexander 1997: 319–24; 1999: 344–48; Lyons and Reimer 1998: 16–32; Chazon 1999: 263; Frennesson 1999: 71–72; Eshel 2003: 69–88.
- 242 Alexander 2006: 69.
- 243 For sevenfold refinement see 1QH^a XIII 15–17. Nitzan 1994b: 165; Davila 1999: 479; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 163.
- 244 *DSSSE* 1032–33 divides the line into two sentences, with “those purified seven times” the object of God’s anger (*אֵפִי אֱלֹהִים*, line 2) and “the holy ones” the subject of God’s sanctifying activity. Their translation reads “Among the holy ones, God makes (some) holy for himself . . .” This is unsatisfactory given the strange notion of God’s wrath being poured

those refined seven times and the holy ones.²⁴⁵ Those refined seven times are clearly humans who have become members of the community.²⁴⁶ The holy ones may be angels, although members of the community are referred to as “the holy ones of his people” (קדושי עמו) in 4Q511 2 I 6 and distinguished from the “angels of his glorious luminaries” (מלאכי כבודו).²⁴⁷ Thus, they could either be angels or other members of the community, distinguished from those refined seven times.²⁴⁸

The list of expressions describing what these purified holy ones become when God sanctifies them is more complex. We have noted line 3 where they will become “an everlasting sanctuary” (למקדש עולמים), that is, a “temple-like community.”²⁴⁹ The succeeding lines describe communion with angels and angelic identity.

Line 4 starts a new sentence describing these sanctified members of the community with a list of epithets מלאכי כבודו ומשרתים (and they will be priests, his righteous people, his host and servants, his glorious angels).²⁵⁰ A new sentence begins in line 5, with the verb יהללוהו (“they shall praise him”). This text apparently identifies the sanctified members of the community as God’s glorious angels, although a variety of ways to avoid this identification have been proposed.

Baillet translates the expression מלאכי כבודו ומשרתים with “ministers of the angels of His glory,” as though the plural absolute noun משרתים was a construct. Thus, he reads the text as saying that the servants of God’s glorious

out on the purified ones. The editors also supply an additional object, “some” for God’s sanctifying activity and ignore the ו (“and”) prefixed to ובקדושים.

245 It seems clear that there are two groups here, given the repetition of the preposition ב (among, see Davila 1999: 479). See the similar construction in Deut 15:19 where the people are to set apart (Hiph, קדש) the firstborn males from among their herd (בבקרד) and from among their flock (בצונד) for YHWH.

246 Most scholars agree that those refined seven times are humans, see Baillet 1982: 237–38; Caquot 1988: 242; Davidson 1992: 283; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 190.

247 Bauckham 2003: 81, who also suggests that “holy ones” in 1QM VI 6; XVI 1 designates humans.

248 Davila 1999: 479 argues that they are angels. Newsom 1990c: 183 suggests that “it is not entirely clear” whether they are humans or angels.

249 Dimant 1986: 188. Frennsson 1999: 74 posits equivalence to the מקדש אדם of 4QmidrEschat* III 6.

250 For this interpretation cf. Gieschen 1998: 174, “where the priests, at least some of them, are identified as angels.” See also Fletcher-Louis 2002: 293–96.

angels praise God.²⁵¹ This is clearly unsatisfactory.²⁵² Another option is to see two groups in line 4. Davidson adopts this reading, with the first group the complement of ויהו ("and they will be") and the second part the subject of יהללוהו ("and they will praise him"). The first group are כוהנים עם צדקו צבאו ("priests, the righteous people, his host") and the second group are ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו ("servants his glorious angels"). On Davidson's reading, this second group alone praise God.²⁵³ While this is a satisfactory reading of the Hebrew, the abrupt introduction of two groups, when the two groups in lines 2–3 were combined to form the temple-like community, is strange. Furthermore, neither of these options solves the problem of identifying the members of the community as angels, since the word צבא in the first half of line 4 already has this connotation.²⁵⁴ There seems to be a single group in view: community members described in angelomorphic or angelic terms.²⁵⁵

Some relegate the description to the eschaton, when some community members "would achieve apotheosis... to serve as priests in the heavenly temple alongside the angels."²⁵⁶ This, too, is unsatisfactory, as there is no suggestion of any temple in this text apart from the temple-community. Nitzan is surely correct in suggesting that these songs are intended to ward off evil spirits in the present, "until the day of their punishment."²⁵⁷ While the verbs are all imperfects, the eschatology is surely realised, with the community seen as "a bridgehead before God's kingdom finally arrived."²⁵⁸

251 Baillet 1982: 237 ("ministres des anges de Sa gloire"). Caquot 1988: 425 also adopts this reading "ceux qui servent Ses anges glorieux."

252 Frennesson 1999: 75 (note 22).

253 Davidson 1992: 284. See also Davila 1999: 479; Sullivan 2004: 165–67.

254 HALOT 995–96, s.v., צבא, A 4–5, B; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 165–66.

255 Frennesson 1999: 75 suggests that these are "likened to, and perhaps even identified with angels." He prefers the former, treating the expression as a metaphor, since he does not find transformation into an angel elsewhere at Qumran. However, there seems no compelling reason to read this epithet differently from the other epithets in the line.

256 Davila 1999: 479. Davidson 1992: 283–85 also adopts this reading, claiming that "[n]owhere else in the corpus is there found an expectation that the sectaries will live in heaven, let alone become angels" (p. 284). Such rigid separation of earth and heaven cannot stand, given that the text has already described the community as a temple. See Fletcher-Louis 2002: 165.

257 Nitzan 1994c: 252. See also p. 237.

258 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 175. If this is a valid reading, it reflects similar ideas to 4QmidrEschat^a, where the temple of Adam is an interim step prior to the establishment of the eschatological temple.

The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

Having discussed several texts where members of the community express the idea that in their worship in the Judean desert they are also somehow worshipping with the angels in heaven, I now turn to the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.²⁵⁹ These Sabbath Songs perhaps present the most developed understanding of the idea of human participation in angelic worship.²⁶⁰ They also contain detailed descriptions of the heavenly temple.²⁶¹

The Sabbath Songs were evidently important for the Qumran community, since no less than ten copies were found, eight in Cave 4, one in Cave 11 and one at Masada.²⁶² They were apparently produced over a period of one hundred and twenty years, from around 75 BCE.²⁶³ While the evidence is debated, Newsom considers that they were probably composed prior to 100 BCE, outside the Qumran community.²⁶⁴ There are thirteen songs, one for each of the

259 For the designation Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice see Strugnell 1960: 318. Strugnell published two scrolls, which he named Serek Širôt 'Ôlat Haššabbat (Rule for the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice).

260 Barnard 2012: 51.

261 Collins 2007a: 299.

262 Morray-Jones 1998: 410–11; Frennesson 1999: 94. Newsom 1985: 74; 1990c: 182.

263 Newsom 1985: 86, 126, 147–48, 168, 186–87, 249–50, 258–59, 355, 359, 363; Alexander 2006: 13–14. The copies found in Cave 11 and at Masada are in late Herodian script, and dated around 50 CE (DJD XI: 239), while those found in Cave 4 are in a Hasmonean script, and all predate the turn of the era. 4Q406 1 2 and perhaps fragment 3 2 has the word אֱלֹהִים in Palaeo-Hebrew characters. Alexander notes (pp. 14–15) little evidence of reworking in the different manuscripts, indicating perhaps that it was a liturgical document, “the text of an important ritual performed by the community, [and] approached in a conservative spirit, the performance being deemed effective only if repeated exactly as transmitted” (p. 15).

264 Newsom 1985: 1–4 adopted the “working hypothesis” that they were a product of the Qumran community. Later she changed her stance suggesting that their origin should be sought outside the Qumran community “in the priestly scribal circles that produced such works as Jubilees or Aramaic Levi” (2000b: 887). This revision arose because of the presence of the copy at Masada, the frequent use of אֱלֹהִים for God, a rare phenomenon at Qumran other than in quotations from the Bible, and the relationship between the Sabbath Songs and other documents considered to be community compositions (1990c: 179–85). More recently still Newsom (2010: 1246) suggests that “on balance [the internal evidence] probably points towards a Qumran origin.” Those who see these songs as a community composition include Strugnell 1960: 318; Yadin 1965: 106; Davidson 1992: 235; Maier 1992: 559–60; Collins 1997a: 141–43; Falk 1998: 126–30; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 394. Nickelsburg 2005: 153 finds community terminology lacking and is uncertain, as is Barnard 2012: 50–51. Alexander 2006: 23–24 believes that the language of the fifth song is “strongly reminiscent of other passages in the Scrolls,” providing evidence that it

thirteen Sabbaths of one quarter of the year,²⁶⁵ ostensibly sung by angels in the heavenly temple.²⁶⁶

The Structure and Purpose of the Sabbath Songs

After a superscription, each song begins with a call to praise (הללו), followed by an epithet for God, and then a substantive addressing those who are called to praise God. For example, 4Q403 1 I 30–31 begins the song for the seventh Sabbath with the words הללו אלוהי מרומים הרמים בכול אלי דעת (“praise the God of the heights you exalted ones among all the gods of knowledge”). It appears that a member of the community (on earth) calls upon heavenly beings to praise God (in heaven). The remainder of each song describes different aspects of this worship.²⁶⁷ It seems clear that the songs imply that the community considered itself to be participating in the liturgy of heaven.²⁶⁸

was either composed by the Qumran sect or is “at least a sectarian reworking of a non-sectarian text.”

265 Newsom 1985: 5, 19, 2000b: 888 considers that they were used in the first quarter only, suggesting that since no other extant scrolls containing any such similar liturgies have been found, it is unlikely that there were other liturgies for the remainder of the year. This does not necessarily follow. Strugnell 1960: 320, who did not have the benefit of the entire corpus, proposed that one such song would have been composed “for every Sabbath of the year according to the Essene calendar.” Maier 1992: 544–45 (and *passim*) finding nothing that points to the first quarter only, considers they were intended for each quarterly cycle throughout the year, as do Nitzan 1994c: 284; Collins 1997a: 136–37; Falk 1998: 136–37 and Alexander 2006: 51.

266 Davidson 1992: 236, 339–42; Alexander 2006: 13.

267 Schwemer 1991: 60–62 considers that the Sabbath Songs have their roots in such texts as Ps 103:19–22 and Dan 3:52–58 (LXX). On the other hand Fletcher-Louis 2002: 261 finds no precedent elsewhere for the (human) “*maskil* who conducts the Sabbath Songs . . . [commanding] the imagined heavenly beings to worship.” He outlines the differences between what is found in the OT and what is found in the Sabbath Songs on pp. 261–62, noting that when texts such as Ps 66:1–3; 96:1–2, 7–9; 103:20–22; 148; 150:6 and the LXX additions to Daniel call upon heavenly beings, and indeed the entire creation, to praise God, they do so with much less detail than is encountered in the Sabbath Songs, and also in the context of human praise. He suggests a “*development*” in the Sabbath Songs from the biblical material, but not a one-to-one correspondence.

268 Newsom 1985: 59–63; 1987: 11. In 1987: 13 Newsom suggests that “this fascination with the angelic priesthood can probably be judged to be an expression of a disenfranchised priestly community’s attempt to clarify its own identity,” an opinion shared by Nickelsburg 2005: 153 and Puech 1987: 605. Strugnell 1960: 320 suggested that the Sabbath Songs were composed either to accompany the sacrifices “schismatically performed” by the Qumran sect, or else as songs “by which these sacrifices were spiritually replaced.” However, the evidence for animal sacrifice at Qumran is mixed. Maier 1992: 552–53

Newsom discerns a pyramid structure, with the seventh song (the most liturgically detailed) at the apex, and other scholars have followed this suggestion.²⁶⁹ She also notes progression from the outer courts of the heavenly sanctuary to the inner sanctum in the ninth to the thirteenth songs, suggesting that it reflects a tour of the heavenly temple, modelled on Ezek 40–48.²⁷⁰ Newsom concludes:

During the course of this thirteen week cycle, the community which recites the compositions is led through a lengthy preparation. The mysteries of the angelic priesthood are recounted, a hypnotic celebration of the sabbatical number seven produces an anticipatory climax at the center of the work, and the community is then gradually led through the spiritually animate heavenly temple until the worshippers experience the holiness of the merkabah and of the Sabbath sacrifice as it is conducted by the high priests of the angels.²⁷¹

While these songs do resemble a heavenly ascent, there is some debate as to precisely what is being described. Newsom proposes a “virtual tour” of the heavenly sanctuary,²⁷² so as to “create and manipulate the virtual experience

proposes that the Sabbath Songs were offered as substitutes for the real Sabbath offerings performed in the Jerusalem temple, and “in a certain sense also staging and participating in the performance of the corresponding ritual in the heavenly sanctuary.” Chazon 1999: 260 proposes several options: “a substitute for the earthly sacrifice; liturgical accompaniment to the angelic offering; communion with the angels; and experiencing the Heavenly Temple.” See also the brief discussion in Barnard 2012: 52–53, and Wardle 2010: 155 who concludes, “if the God of Israel could be worshipped in the desert in the same manner in which he was acclaimed in heaven, what was the need for travelling to the polluted temple in Jerusalem.”

269 Newsom 1985: 13–17; Maier 1992: 546; Falk 1998: 133; Frennesson 1999: 96; Davila 2000: 84. Baumgarten 1988: 206–7 suggests that Newsom pays too little attention to the progression towards a climax in the ninth to the thirteenth songs. Morray-Jones 1998: 417–19 finds that the seventh song is a “preliminary crescendo,” and that the real climax comes in the twelfth song with a vision of the *Merkabah*, as does Barnard 2012: 52. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 382–88 argues that the climax comes in the thirteenth song, with the vision of God enthroned in the holy of holies. A climax in the God’s presence seems more likely than earlier in the liturgy.

270 Newsom 1985: 14, 52–57.

271 Ibid.: 19; Frennesson 1999: 100; Nitzan 2000: 139–45 express similar ideas with respect to both 4QBerakhot and the Sabbath Songs.

272 Newsom 1990a: 115. Davila 1999: 480 suggests that “there is no indication that any human being has ascended or is expected to ascend to heaven to view these marvels,” but goes

of being present in the heavenly temple and in the presence of the angelic priests who serve there.”²⁷³ Since the Qumran priests had withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple, this would give them the experience of serving in the true temple above.²⁷⁴ Along the same lines, Strugnell suggests that the worship takes place on earth and that “the presence of the angels is in a sense invoked.”²⁷⁵ He further suggests that these songs are “a composition . . . in which the Heavenly Temple is portrayed on the model of the earthly one and in some way its service is considered a pattern of what is being done below.”²⁷⁶ Fletcher-Louis refers to the heavenly ascent “form,” with a progression into the inner sanctum of the heavenly holy of holies, not of “an individual . . . [but a] corporate ritualized ascent . . . [with] some genetic relationship to the heavenly ascents of the apocalypses and early *Merkabah Mysticism*.”²⁷⁷ And Morray-Jones contends that since worship in the earthly temple is in effect also worship in heaven, the human worshippers (on earth) join with “the angelic hierarchy in its worship before the throne.”²⁷⁸ And along similar lines Nitzan concludes that “a congregation composed of the members of the sect and the angels . . . joining together . . . in one song of praise, which in the other scrolls is no more than an abstract idea, is here embodied in a concrete-liturgical act.”²⁷⁹ In what follows I discuss salient points in the songs for the first two and the sixth Sabbath, followed by some aspects of the descriptions of the heavenly temple in the other songs.

on to agree with Newsom in positing “some such virtual experience or ascent by wishful thinking.” See also Strugnell 1960: 335–36; Wolfson 1994: 196–99, and Himmelfarb 1993: 49, “[t]he recitation of the Sabbath Songs with their description of the liturgy in the heavenly temple was intended to create a feeling of participation in the service on high.”

273 Newsom 1990a: 115, see also Barnard 2012: 53.

274 Newsom 1990a; 1985: 72; Davila 1999: 480; Collins 1997a: 140.

275 Strugnell 1960: 320.

276 Ibid.: 320. See also Davila 2000: 91 (note 12), who refers to the ancient concept that “the earthly sanctuary is a shadow of the archetypal heavenly sanctuary.”

277 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 387.

278 Morray-Jones 1998: 420. In Jub. 2:17–22 the angels and Israel keep the Sabbath together, something Schwemer 1991: 53 considers “takes place in heaven and on earth,” although for Schwemer, this takes place on earth (for the community) and in heaven (for the angels) simultaneously.

279 Nitzan 1994c: 292–93.

The First and Second Songs

The first song (4Q400 1 I 2) calls on the “the gods of all the holiest of the holy ones” (אלוהי כול קדושי קדושים, line 2),²⁸⁰ to praise God,²⁸¹ since they, “the holiest of the holy ones” (קדושי קדושים, line 3), “have become priests for him (God)” (ויהיו לו לכוהני, line 3),²⁸² “ministers of the presence in his glorious inner sanctum” (משרתי פנים בדביר כבודו, line 4), “in the congregation of all the gods of [knowledge]” (דעת) לכול אלי (lines 4–5). The song concludes with the claim that they have become “gods, priests of exalted heights” (אלים כוהני, line 20).²⁸³ These tolerate no impurity, they make atonement (ויכפרו, line 16) for the depraved who repent, and they teach (הורו, line 17). These are apparently the angelic priesthood worshipping God in the heavenly temple,²⁸⁴

280 Newsom 1985: 93 renders אלוהי with “god-like ones.” Davila 2000: 99 renders the word with “divinities.” Fletcher-Louis 2002: 280 transliterates with “*elohim*.” The translation “gods” is from *DSSSE* 807.

281 Newsom 1985: 89, followed by *DSSSE* 807 inserts the word -- לאלוהי (“to the God of...”) in a lacuna at the start of line 2, following הללו (“praise”) at the end of line 1. On p. 97 Newsom notes that “since אלוהים is such an unusual term for the angels, I have tried to translate in ways that underscore its aura of divinity.”

282 The י suffix on לכוהני is apparently a plural construct ending, and both *DSSSE* 808 and Newsom (ibid.: 89) restore קורב (“inner sanctum”) at the start of line 4. In DJD 11 Newsom omits this reconstruction (p. 178).

283 The translation “priests of exalted heights” is from Davila 2000: 98–99. *DSSSE* 808–9 translates אלים with “divinities.” Only a ל survives from the preceding word, which Newsom 1985: 89 reconstructs as אלוהי, and translates either as “God of the angels” or “godlike angels” (which she prefers, p. 106) in apposition to the expression כוהני מרומי רום. Newsom renders the latter expression “priests of the lofty heavens,” referring to Ps 148:1; Job 16:19.

284 Newsom 1985: 95–109; Davila 2000: 97; Alexander 2006: 15–17. While Strugnell did not cover the first song, he also referred to this idea (Strugnell 1960: 320, 335). Davila notes the expression קדושים most often refers to angels in the Hebrew Bible, and in the literature of Second Temple Judaism (Deut 33:3; Ps 89:6, 8; Job 5:1; 15:5; Zech 14:5; 1QApGen 11 1; 1QDM 1V 1; 1QS XI 7–8; 1QSB I 5; 1QM I 16; X 11–12; XII 1, 4, 7; XV 14; 1QH^a XI 21–22; XVII 35; 4Q181 I 11 4; 4Q510 I 2; 1QMelch 11 9. See also Dan 4:17 (MT v. 15, Aramaic, קדישין); 1 En. 1:9; 14:23; T. Job 33:2; Jub. 31:14; Pss. Sol. 17:49 (Greek, ἄγιοι). See Brekelmans 1965: 304–29; Collins 1993: 312–18. On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis 2002: 252–394 argues that these descriptions apply to members of the Qumran community, or an inner core of these members who have taken on an angelic or angelomorphic identity. Charlesworth 1980: 135 and Davila 2000: 97 note that קדושים can refer to humans, and this seems to be the case Ps 34:10. The Greek equivalent refers to humans in Tob 8:15; Acts 9:13; Rom 8:27; 1 Tim 5:10; Heb 6:10, and seems to be Paul’s favourite expression for the people of God. Collins 1993: 316 claims that there is “no undisputed case in ... [the Qumran] literature ... where the expression ‘holy ones’ in itself refers to human beings.” However, in 1QM VI 6; XVI 1; 4Q511

and the community that performed this liturgy understood itself as worshiping with these angels, albeit from their location in the Judean desert.

In the second song, lines 6–8 of 4Q400 2 refer to “us,”²⁸⁵ “and our priesthood” (וכהנתנו), “and our holiness” (וק[ודשנו]) and the “offering of our tongue of dust” (תרומת לשון עפרנו).²⁸⁶ Here the human community is compared negatively with the exalted angelic priesthood.²⁸⁷ Only here in the Sabbath Songs does the speaker speak in the first person, and what he says appears to show the “inadequacy of all human cult, all human praise.”²⁸⁸ Humans are simply not good enough to join in angelic heavenly worship.²⁸⁹ However, in Newsom’s view the ideal realm of the heavenly cult is made present to the human worshippers, and “a common experience is generated through the power of the language of the songs to invoke and make present the worship of the heavenly temple.”²⁹⁰

2 I 6 references to the “holy ones of his people” seem to refer to humans. On this see Bauckham 2003: 81. Thus Davila 2000: 100 proposes that that in the Sabbath Songs, “the main reference seems to be to angels, although the inclusion of the proleptically glorified human worshippers may be implied as well.” See also Davidson 1992: 236 and his Appendix D (pp. 339–42), and Barnard 2012: 53 (note 114). Schäfer 2009: 144 finds almost no references to humans in the Sabbath Songs.

285 The expression **מה נתחשב** [ב]ם in line 6 is usually translated “how shall we be regarded among them,” with **נתחשב** construed as a first person plural Hithpael imperfect (Newsom 1985: 111; 1998: 188; Davila 2000: 108; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 306). *DSSSE* 811 reads **נתחשב** as a third person masculine singular Niphal perfect and translates “how will it be regarded,” referring to the priesthood of the human community (which appears explicitly in the following clause).

286 These translations are from Newsom 1998: 188.

287 Newsom 1985: 115–16; 1998: 190–91; Davidson 1992: 237, 245; Nitzan 1994c: 291–92, 343; 2000: 144; Stuckenbruck 1995: 158–59, 248; Davila 2000: 109; Gäbel 2006: 63; Alexander 2006: 20–46.

288 Newsom 1990a: 117.

289 Calaway 2013: 169 (note 92) finds here “a distancing within identification of divine and human communities as they are joined together”.

290 Newsom 1990a: 117. In 1985: 17 Newsom refers to “ecstatic experiences,” and on p. 65 she considers that through the “descriptions of heavenly worship . . . the earthly community evokes that sense of being present in the heavenly temple.” Nitzan 1994b: 182–83 considers that “human beings do not participate in the choirs of the angelic hosts, nor ascend to the heavenly sanctuaries to be close to the angelic choirs . . . Nevertheless . . . [the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice] may have been considered as a medium for creating an experience of mystic communion between the earthly and the heavenly worshippers, each one of which kept the Sabbath law in their respective dwellings, but with a single, united faith.” Alexander 2006: 20 suggests that the human praise takes place on earth, “effecting

Fletcher-Louis compares 4Q511 35 where the language of human exaltation exists alongside the self-deprecating language of 4Q511 30 4–6, noting that these two understandings co-exist “because what man is by nature is one thing and what he may become by the power of God is quite another.”²⁹¹ This text in the Sabbath Songs is not, therefore, so much a description of the angelic priesthood and a comparison with the human community, but rather, “an antiphonal response of the human to the angelic praise,”²⁹² concluding with a call to the community to join in the angelic praise.

Rather than describing (true) worship in heaven above corresponding to (inadequate) worship in the earth below, the two are the same, and the text envisages the human community worshipping as part of the angelic priesthood in a genuine *Engelgemeinschaft*.²⁹³ The questions in lines 5–7 anticipate the exaltation of the human community. They ask (rhetorically) how their worship could compare with that of angels, and then encourage one another to worship along with the angelic worship (line 8), as in line 1.²⁹⁴

The Sixth Song

The third to the fifth songs are poorly preserved, especially the third and fourth songs, of which very little survives.²⁹⁵ In contrast, the sixth song may be the best preserved of all, with around seventy-five percent intact.²⁹⁶

on earth the sort of liturgy performed by the angels in heaven, and in communion with them.”

291 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 307.

292 Ibid.: 308.

293 Ibid.: 308. Compare Gäbel 2006: 68, “Die ShirShabb sprechen also nicht davon, dass die irdische Gemeinschaft am himmlischen Gottesdienst der Engel teilhat oder dass sie ihren irdischen Gottesdienst mit dem himmlischen vereint. Vielmehr besteht folgende doppelte Korrespondenz zwischen himmlischen und irdischen Priestern: Die irdische Priesterschaft blickt am Tage der Priesterinvestitur zur himmlischen Priesterschaft und deren Investitur durch Gott auf, und im Bewusstsein der Unvollkommenheit allen irdisch-menschlichen Kults vergegenwärtigt sie sich den vollkommenen Gehorsam und den fehlerlosen Kultdienst der Engel-Priester.” Stuckenbruck 1995: 159–60 notes that the cohortative נְרוּמָה (“let us extol”) in line 8 indicates that “despite a sense of unworthiness, the worshippers are nevertheless able to participate in the heavenly cult.”

294 Wolfson 1994: 186 refers to “angelification,” whereby a human “crosses the boundary of space and time and becomes part of the heavenly realm.” Later (p. 199), he suggests that 4Q400 2 6–8 express “. . . the desire of the sectarians to join the angelic host above,” concurring with Newsom’s notion of a “virtual experience of being present in the heavenly temple.”

295 Alexander 2006: 22–25.

296 Ibid.: 25.

The song concerns seven “chief princes” (נשיאי רוש, see e.g. 4Q403 1 I 1, 21, 23) who offer seven psalms of praise to God, and then deliver a series of seven blessings. These princes appear to be angelic beings, perhaps seven archangels,²⁹⁷ although the designation “chief princes” seems odd.²⁹⁸ Since they perform priestly functions, offering praise to God and delivering blessings,²⁹⁹ they should be seen as angelic priests, a designation that is explicit in the Eighth Song for what is apparently a second order of angelic priests.³⁰⁰

More relevant for my purposes is the identification of the recipients of the blessings. Newsom is inclined to the opinion that they are also angels, although surmises that they may also include the human community combined with the angels.³⁰¹ On the other hand Fletcher-Louis thinks that they are humans alone.³⁰² However, they do seem to combine both angelic and human characteristics.³⁰³ In several places they are referred to as אלים (“gods,” “divine beings”),³⁰⁴ in the first blessing they are יד[ו]ע עולמ[י] (“eternal

-
- 297 Newsom 1985: 34 suggests that this is “virtually certain.” See also Alexander 2006: 26 (“one of the highest orders on angel priests in the Qumran hierarchy of angels”). Davila 2000: 120–21 has amassed considerable evidence for their angelic character, including references to seven angels in Tob 12:15; 1 En. 20:1–8 (The Ethiopic text has six angels, and the Greek text seven, see Nickelsburg 2001: 294–96); T. Levi 8:2. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 316–19 argues that they are exalted humans.
- 298 *DCH* 5: 772–74 only lists the Sabbath Songs as instances where נשיאי has the sense of “angelic figures, including the high priest of the angels.” *HALOT* 727–28 does not make this connection.
- 299 Gaster 1976: 285–88 argues that the blessings are modelled on the Aaronic blessing of Num 6:24–27. Newsom 1985: 197 is sceptical of Gaster’s reconstruction, finding the correspondences to be too general for any certainty. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 316–17 uses this as a plank of his argument that the chief princes are transformed humans, but there seems to be no reason why blessings delivered by priestly angels could not correspond in some way to the Aaronic blessing.
- 300 Davila 2000: 132. See 4Q403 1 II 21, reconstructed from 4Q405 8–9 4–5 where they are referred to as רושי נשיאי כוה[נות]. See the discussion in Newsom 1985: 34–35.
- 301 Newsom 1985: 196.
- 302 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 314–16.
- 303 Alexander 2006: 27–28.
- 304 Newsom 1985: 188 inserts this word at the end of 4Q403 1 I 14 (Fletcher-Louis 2002: 318, note 26 finds this conjectural, although Davila 2000: 118 adopts this reading, as does *DSSSE* 816). It is partially reconstructed in line 18 in the phrase כול אי[לי] קרו[בים] (“all the divine beings who draw near”), and it appears intact in the summary of the blessings in line 26 in the expression ל[א]ל[ו]הי אלים (“... the God of the divine beings”). This last instance can be read in several different ways. Newsom 1985: 195 reads “the godlike heavenly beings;” Davila 2000: 119 and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 313 read “the God of gods;” and Alexander 2006: 27 transliterates “Elohei ‘Elim” and argues that these are “clearly angels.”

knowing ones”³⁰⁵ or “those who have knowledge of eternal things”),³⁰⁶ and in the second blessing they are טהורי עולמים (“eternally pure”).³⁰⁷ These expressions seem to most naturally refer to angels. On the other hand, the sixth blessing is addressed to כול תמימי דרך (“those whose way is perfect”), a designation that seems more naturally to refer to humans.³⁰⁸ This song is further witness to humans and angels participating together in worship in the heavenly temple, whose boundaries also include worshippers on earth.³⁰⁹

Other Relevant Material in the Sabbath Songs

Several other expressions in the Sabbath Songs are relevant to the present study.³¹⁰

The Heavenly Tabernacle (משכן)

The Sabbath Songs describe the heavenly sanctuary with the word משכן in 4Q403 1 II 10.³¹¹ Newsom translates the complete Hebrew expression ומשכן רוש

Certainty as to whether God or angels are being addressed here is not possible. In his treatment of the first and second Sabbath Songs, Fletcher-Louis 2002: 280–309 argues that the אלים are exalted humans, but this has not been generally accepted, see, e.g. the critique in Alexander 2006: 45–47. Three reviews of Fletcher-Louis’s work critique this reading. Collins 2003: 74 considers that his “assessment of the prevalence of ‘angelomorphic humanity’ is maximalist” and questions the use of אלים and אלהים to refer to humans (p. 77), although he does suggest that Fletcher-Louis has “raised new possibilities and opened up questions that invite a fresh look at the text [of the Sabbath songs]” (p. 79); Goff 2003a: 174 reaches similar conclusions, and Newsom 2003: 433 is “intrigued though largely not persuaded.” She does concede that Fletcher-Louis has “raised an important question that deserves further attention” (p. 434), concluding that a closer look at angelomorphism is deserved (p. 435).

305 Translation from Davila 2000: 118.

306 Newsom 1985: 193; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 313. For this description see 4Q286 7 I 6.

307 Newsom 1985: 194; Davila 2000: 118; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 312.

308 Davila 2000: 121–22; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 315; Alexander 2006: 27. This expression delineates members of the community in 1QS II 2; 111 9–10; IV 22; VIII 10, 18; IX 5, 9; 1QM XIV 7; 1QH^a IX 37; CD II 15–16.

309 Alexander 2006: 27–28; Barnard 2012: 53.

310 Possible references to Melchizedek appear in several fragments of the Sabbath Songs, although the name needs to be reconstructed in every case. While Melchizedek is important in Hebrews, his priesthood, and that of Jesus, is peripheral to this study. For this discussion see Mason 2008: 138–68.

311 משכן also appears in 4Q405 20 II 21–22, line 7. See Newsom 1998: 345, 350; Sterling 2001: 207 notes that apart from Hebrews and Rev 13:6; 15:5; 21:3, only here in the literature is the heavenly sanctuary referred to as a tabernacle.

רום כבוד מלכותו דביר “the uppermost exalted tabernacle, the glory of His kingdom, the inner shrine,” while Davila translates משכן רוש רום “tabernacle of the exalted chief,” arguing that while there is no evidence elsewhere for multiple tabernacles in heaven,³¹² there is evidence of “an angelic or divinized human high priest serving in the heavenly tabernacle.”³¹³ The syntax of the sentence is ambiguous. However the words are read, the text refers to a tabernacle as either the entire heavenly temple or as the *debir* of the heavenly temple. While the details are debated, Heb 8:1–2 also refers to the heavenly (and eschatological) temple as τῆς σακηνης τῆς ἀληθινῆς (“the true tent/tabernacle”).

The Curtain

A tantalising fragmentary reference to the heavenly sanctuary in 4Q402 2 3–4 includes the expression [...] בדביר מלך [...] [כ]מעשי רוק[מה]. Davila translates this with “workmanship of colorful stuff [...] in the inner chamber of the king.”³¹⁴ Newsom notes that the expression מעשי רקם is used for both the priestly garments and the hangings of the wilderness shrine.³¹⁵ This workmanship refers to the curtain in the heavenly temple. Further detail concerning the curtain concealing the *debir* in the heavenly temple appears in the tenth song, where the inner shrine is described as “the *debir* of his presence” (דביר פנו, 4Q405 15 11–16 4) and the veil is described as “the veil of the *debir* of the king”

312 Davila 2000: 128. Alexander 2006: 53–54 finds the idea of multiple temples and sanctuaries in heaven at the proposed date of composition of the Sabbath Songs “unusual.” He suggests this expression might be symbolic, “a rhetorical device, which expresses the transcendent perfection of the celestial temple.” Barker 2008: 247 suggests it might mean “the fullness, the totality.” Newsom 1998: 285 suggests that if Davila’s translation is valid, the “exalted chief” refers either to God or to “a single superior angel.” The expression רושי דבירו (“chiefs of his *debir*”) appears in the following line. It would be strange for רוש to have these two different senses in such close proximity, especially as Davila 2000: 128 notes, the word usually has a personal reference. Thus, Davila’s reading is more likely.

313 Davila 2000: 129. See e.g. 3 En. 15B:1 and Num. Rab. 12:12. NRSV translates Heb 8:2 with reference to Jesus as “a minister in the [heavenly] sanctuary.” I argue in chapter 8 (below) that the genitive expression τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργός should be rendered “a minister of the sanctuary.”

314 Ibid.: 112. Davila equates the noun רוקמה with רקם, see Jastrow 1989: 1497; HALOT 1290, 1291, and Qimron 1986: 39–40, para. 200.26, who notes that in Qumran orthography a *waw* sometimes appears where the Tiberian tradition has *qamets*, *pathach* or *seghol*. Raymond 2014: 172 translates the expression “embroidered work.”

315 Newsom 1998: 225–26. The expression refers to the fabric of the tabernacle hangings and screen in Exod 26:36; 27:16; 36:37; 38:18, and for the high priest’s tunic in 28:39 and 39:29. In Philo the curtain and the priestly garments have the same cosmic significance. See my discussion in chapter 2 (above).

(פרוכת דביר המלך, 4Q405 15 11–16 3)³¹⁶ or the “veils of the wondrous *debirim*” (פרכות דבירי הפלא, 4Q405 15 11–16 5).³¹⁷ The figures embroidered on either side of the veil sing their praises to God.³¹⁸

What remains of the ninth song refers to “the vestibules where the king enters” (באומי מבאוי מלך, 4Q405 14–15 1 5) and “the vestibules of their entrances” (אומי מבואיהם, 4Q405 14–15 1 4). Newsom finds here an allusion to such texts as Ezek 44:3; 46:8 where the prince is permitted to enter the sanctuary forecourts, and suggests that the vestibules in line 5 are of the inner sanctuary where the King (God) enters, alluding to Ps 24:7, 9.³¹⁹ If so, the heavenly temple in the Sabbath Songs is a bicameral structure like the wilderness tabernacle. Alexander agrees, drawing the analogy from Ezekiel’s temple in Ezek 40:7–8.³²⁰ However, it is difficult to determine whether or not the Sabbath Songs envisage a bicameral structure. Fletcher-Louis points out that the engraving of animate figures in Ezekiel’s temple vision is on the vestibule of “the inner sanctuary proper,” and proposes that this song is not about a two chambered structure, but about the Holy of Holies, where the King (God), rather than the prince of Ezek 44:3; 46:8, enters.³²¹

While Hebrews has little interest in the detail of the heavenly temple, two references to the veil or curtain (καταπέτασμα, 6:19; 10:20) and one reference to the curtain in the wilderness sanctuary (9:3), have led some to argue that Hebrews also envisages a bicameral heavenly temple, corresponding to the earthly tabernacle.

תבנית

The word תבנית appears twice in Exod 25:9 (LXX παράδειγμα), in Exod 25:40 (LXX τύπος), quoted in Heb 8:5, and in 1 Chr 28:11, 12, 18, 19, referring to the plan or model provided to Moses and Solomon for use in the construction

316 The Hebrew word פרוכת used here is the word for the veil concealing the Holy of Holies in OT. See e.g. Exod 26:33–37; 36:35–38. In Exod 39:34; 40:21; Num 4:5 it is the פרכת המסך.

317 Newsom 1998: 336 notes the plural in this last description, but make no attempt to explain it. Alexander 2006: 36 suggests that it may refer to the seven *debirim*.

318 For rabbinic literature describing the veil as having figures on both sides see Baraytha b. Yoma 72b; y. Sheqalim 8.2; Rashi on Exod 26:1, 36. See Haran 1985: 161.

319 Newsom 1985: 281; 1998: 333.

320 Alexander 2006: 34–35.

321 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 340. Koester 1989: 39 suggests that the tabernacle in the Sabbath Songs seems to be only the divine throne room and is not a two-part structure, as was the wilderness tabernacle. Alexander 2006: 35 suggests that while two chambers are envisaged, this description might be of the inner shrine only.

of the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple respectively.³²² The same word also appears in several places in the Sabbath Songs, and in most, if not all, of these the sense is “structure,” rather than “pattern.”³²³ In 4Q405 20 II 21–22 8, however, Newsom translates מרכבה כסא תבנית with “the image of the chariot throne,”³²⁴ proposing that the expression is an allusion to 1 Chr 28:18 (תבנית המרכבה הכרבים זהב, “the plan of the chariot, the golden cherubim”) and Exod 25:40.³²⁵ It is conceivable that the Sabbath Songs could be read with תבנית understood to refer to that plan or model; however, it is difficult to understand what this contributes to the understanding of the text. It is more likely that the reference is to a “structure,” rather than a “plan,” as in Exod 25 and 1 Chr 28.³²⁶ Thus, the word appears to have quite a different sense than in these texts and in Exod 25:40 quoted in Heb 8:5.³²⁷

-
- 322 The word also has other senses in the OT. In Deut 4:17, 18, 19; Josh 22:8; Ps 106:20; Isa 44:13; Ezek 8:3, 10; 10:8 it has the sense of “form, image, likeness, representation,” and in 2 Kings 16:10; Ps 144:12 it refers to a “model.”
- 323 4Q403 1 I 44; 4Q403 1 II 3//4Q404 6 5; 4Q403 1 II 16; 4Q405 20 II 21–22 8; 11Q17 VIII 3 and 11Q17 IX 6. In 4Q403 1 II 16 the Hebrew expression is ראשי תבנית אלהים. Newsom 1998: 282 translates this as “the chiefs of the divine structure.” The word has the sense of “image” or “pattern” elsewhere at Qumran. See 1QM x 14 (תבנית אדם, “human image”); 4Q417 2 I 17//4Q418 43–45 I 13 (כתבנית קדושים) “according to the pattern of the holy ones”). For the sense “structure” see 4Q286 1 II 6 (תבנית דעה, “structure of knowledge”); 4Q287 2 2 (תב[ניות הדרמה]...), “majestic structures”).
- 324 Ibid.: 347. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 345 suggests that this rendering could mislead someone into thinking it was a reference to an image “on” a throne, as in Ezek 1:26–28. Fletcher-Louis himself translates “the pattern/construction of the chariot throne,” while in his discussion he uses the term “the structure of the throne” (p. 347). Compare Strugnell 1960: 337, “the structure of the chariot throne;” Schwemer 1991: 108, “Das Urbild des Thronwagens;” Davila 2000: 151, “the structure of a throne chariot,” and DSSSE 833, “the image of the throne chariot.”
- 325 Newsom 1998: 351. See also Rowland 1979: 143; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 345.
- 326 The word תבנית appears to also have this sense in 4Q287 2 2.
- 327 Davila 2002: 3–5 suggests that the account of the tabernacle building in Exodus is reflected in some of the details of the heavenly sanctuary in the Sabbath Songs, and refers specifically to תבנית in Exod 25:9, 40. Koester 1989: 39 is right when he claims that תבנית is not used in the Sabbath Songs in the sense of “the heavenly pattern of the earthly sanctuary.” Although HALOT 1686–87 gives the sense “construction, shape” at the beginning of the entry, the editors give no instances of this sense in the Hebrew Bible. See Jastrow 1989: 1645.

The Throne

God's throne appears four times in Hebrews as a metonym for God's rule (4:16; 8:1; 12:2), or the rule of the exalted Son (1:8).³²⁸ God's throne also appears several times in the Sabbath Songs. The seventh song ends with a detailed description of the heavenly sanctuary, concluding with a reference to "a plurality of animate *merkabot* which praise God."³²⁹ This text depends to some extent on Ezek 1 and 10, with imagery that resurfaces in the eleventh and twelfth songs where the merkabah throne reappears. These chapters of Ezekiel seem not to have had any influence on the author of Hebrews.³³⁰

References to the throne in the Sabbath Songs alternate between singular and plural.³³¹ In 11Q17 v 8 (the ninth or tenth song)³³² the expression כסאי עולמים ("eternal thrones") appears.³³³ Alexander notes that in the present context it is "pluralized, because there is a divine throne on which the divine presence manifests itself in each of the seven *debirs*."³³⁴ Thus, the Sabbath Songs seem to refer to multiple thrones or seats. The eleventh song mentions a seat like his royal throne (מושב כבסא מלכותו) along with references to the plural *merkabot* (4Q405 20 II 21–22 2–5). The priests stand and serve this seat, which may not be the divine throne, but a seat like it, suggesting the enthronement of some other figure.³³⁵ Davila refers to "this seated being,"³³⁶ suggesting that greater angels sit, while lesser angels stand. On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis wonders whether there might be "an empty throne."³³⁷ Then, following Davila he proposes that while humans are entitled to sit in heaven, non-humans

328 In Second Temple Judaism an exalted figure is sometimes seen as enthroned alongside God and invested with authority as God's chief agent. See Hurtado 1988: 53–59, 66. See Wis 9:4; 1 En. 45:3; 3 En. 10:1; Ezek. Trag. 68–89; Lad. Jac. 2:7; 4Q491c 1 4–6. In Zech 6:13 there is a priest alongside the throne, a text echoed in Heb 8:1–2.

329 Newsom 1987: 14.

330 NA²⁸ (pp. 863–65) only detects allusions to Ezekiel in Hebrews 10:22 (Ezek 36:25); 10:25 (Ezek 7:4, LXX 7:7); 10:28 (Ezek 22:26); 11:7 (Ezek 14:14, 20); 13:10 (Ezek 44:10–14); 13:20 (Ezek 37:26).

331 See 4Q405 20 II 21–22 2 (singular), 4Q405 20 II 21–22 8 (singular), 4Q405 23 I 3 (plural, translated as a singular in Newsom 1998: 356–57; DSSSE 834–35 and Fletcher-Louis 2002 351, but as a singular by Davila 2000: 154), 11Q17 x 7 (plural) and 11Q17 VII 2 (singular).

332 Newsom 1998: 335.

333 Newsom 1985: 378 hesitatingly restores כן פלא א[י] ("wonderful throne") at 11Q17 IV 6. DSSSE 1214–15 restores כן פלא א[י] ("wonderful appearance"), as do Davila 2000: 137 and García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998: 275.

334 Alexander 2006: 36–37.

335 Davila 2000: 146.

336 Ibid.: 146.

337 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 344. Bauckham 1999: 52 notes that God alone sits in heaven.

are not.³³⁸ The twelfth song mentions the *תבנית כסא מרכבה* (“the structure of the throne of the merkabah,” 4Q405 20 11 21–22 8), followed by the expression *מושב כבודו* (“his glorious seat”). Near the end of this song there is another reference to “his glorious royal throne(s)” (*בסאיכה כבוד מלכותו*), 4Q405 23 1 3).³³⁹ In Heb 8:1; 12:2 there is a single throne of God in heaven, with Jesus exalted to God’s right hand on this throne.³⁴⁰ This expression seems to be a metonym for his rule alongside God in fulfillment of Ps 110:1, and the author of Hebrews did not necessarily imagine an actual “throne” in heaven as in the Sabbath Songs.

Sacrifice in Heaven

In 4Q400 1 1 16 the heavenly priesthood is said to make atonement for those who repent, although no details are given as to what this involves. Some have argued that the references to sacrifices in the thirteenth song refer to sacrifices in heaven (11Q17 1X 3–5, 4Q405 23 11 12–13 and perhaps 4Q405 94 1–2).³⁴¹ In 4Q405 23 11 12–13 the sacrificial language seems to be metaphorical. The word used is *תרומה* (praise-offering),³⁴² and the same line refers to “tongues of knowledge” (*לשוני דעת*) which “bless the God of knowledge” (*ברכו לאלוהי דעת*).

Aside from this, *זבח* (“sacrifice”) appears in 4Q405 94 2 and 11Q17 1X 4, and while it is devoid of any context in 4Q405, in 11Q17 it is part of a list which includes “offerings” (*מנחות*) and “libations” (*נסכים*). The text is fragmented and contains little detail apart from this list. The use of *זבח*, which in the OT usually refers to the slaughter of sacrificial animals, could imply animal sacrifice in heaven.³⁴³ But while *זבח* usually refers to animal sacrifice in the OT,

338 See Ezek. Trag. 68–89; 1 En. 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:29, 108:12; Mark 14:62; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1–4; Rev 3:21; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12–13; 12:2; Asc. Isa. 9:24–26 as evidence for humans permitted to sit in heaven, and Gen. Rab. 65:21 for angels who are not permitted to do so.

339 The letters *כה* in *כסאיכה* are marked by the scribe for deletion, and the letter *כ* in the following word (*כבוד*) is written in above the line. This gives the appearance of a transcription error with the words *כסאי כבוד* originally written as *כוד כסאיכה* and subsequently corrected. See the discussion in Newsom 1985: 325, and PAM Image 43727 in Reynolds, Parry, Wilson and Booras 1998.

340 Bauckham 1999: 61–64; 2009: 17.

341 See Newsom 1998: 393. 4Q405 94 1–2 consists of the single word *הזבחים*. For sacrifices in heaven see Davila 2000: 157–61; Newsom 1985: 371–77; 1998: 361–66; Alexander 2006: 43–44.

342 DSSSE 836–37.

343 Deut 12:15, 21; 1 Kings 1:9, 19, 25; 2 Chr 18:2 and frequently elsewhere. Davila 2000: 158 finds this usage in 11Q17 “remarkable,” and Falk 1998: 135–36 makes similar points about *נסך*, *זבח* and *מנחה* in the DSS. He notes an “understandable reluctance [on the part of Newsom 1985: 18–19, 59; 1990a: 114] to imagine actual animal sacrifice in heaven,” but appeals

the sacrifices are most often connected with communal meals, creating communion between God and his people, and among the people of God,³⁴⁴ and at times the word seems to refer to “the celebration of the ritual (sacrificial festival or meal)” itself.³⁴⁵ These considerations and the fragmentation of the text render impossible any certainty as to whether a sacrificial cult in heaven is envisaged.

There are few explicit references elsewhere in the literature to a heavenly sacrificial cult.³⁴⁶ In most of these it is clear that the sacrificial language is used metaphorically and not for animal sacrifice.³⁴⁷ It seems more likely that the use of sacrificial terms such as *מנחות רצון* (“acceptable offerings”),³⁴⁸ *זבחי קדושים* (“sacrifices of the holy ones”), *ריח מנחותם* (“aroma of their offerings”) and *ריח נסביהם* (“aroma of their libations”) in 11Q17 refer not to sacrifices offered in heaven, but to the “(real and/or metaphorical) cultic activity of the

to T. Levi 3:5 and Rev 6:9 (sic); 8:3–5, which he suggests indicates that heaven “presumably” contained an altar of burnt offering. See the discussion of these altars in Beale 1999: 454–60. T. Levi 3:5–6 specifically states that those sacrifices are bloodless. There is no reference to an altar of incense in the Sabbath Songs (Fletcher-Louis 2002: 360).

344 *HALOT* 262–63; Tengström and Fabry 1980: 8–29. See Gen 31:54; Exod 18:12; 29:28; 34:15; Lev 3:1, 3, 6, 9; 4:10, 26, 31, 35; 7:11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 32, 34, 37; 9:18; 10:14; 17:5; 19:5, 6; 22:21, 29; 23:19, 37; Num 6:17, 18; 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88; 10:10; 15:3, 8; Deut 12:27; 18:3; 32:38; Josh 22:23, 27; Judg 16:23; 1 Sam 2:13, 29; 9:13; 10:8; 11:15; 16:3, 5; 20:6, 29; Neh 12:43; 1 Chr 29:21; 2 Chr 7:5; 30:22; 33:16; Ps 106:28; 107:22; 116:17; Prov 17:1; Jer 7:21; 17:26; Ezek 39:17, 19; Hos 8:13. For a metaphorical use see Ps 51:17.

345 *Ibid.*: 12. See Exod 34:15; Lev 19:6; Num 25:2; Deut 32:38; 1 Sam 9:13; Prov 17:1; Ezek 39:17, 19; Zeph 1:7.

346 Himmelfarb 1993: 33–36; Newsom 1998: 372.

347 T. Levi 3:5–6; Jub. 6:18 (Feast of Weeks); 3 Bar 14 where Michael brings human prayers to God, and b. Hag. 12b where he offers sacrifices in heaven. Bietenhard 1951: 125 suggests that the heavenly priesthood of Michael in b. Hag. 12b is “an interim and stopgap measure” in force from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem until the restoration of Israel and the earthly sanctuary. Ego 1991: 370–71 suggests that the destruction of the temple in 70 CE modified the understanding of the traditions surrounding the heavenly temple. Prior to that, the heavenly temple served to legitimise the earthly one, but when the earthly cult ceased it became a replacement for it. Ultimately, this led to the tradition of Michael’s heavenly sacrifices, which Hannah 1999: 101, 150–51 suggests may have originated “in the closing decades of the first century at the latest.” Nonetheless, even in b. Hag. 12b what Michael offers is a *קרבן* (a vague general word for an offering and not necessarily a blood sacrifice) rather than *זבח* (“animal sacrifice”). See *HALOT* 1136–37; Jastrow 1989: 1411.

348 Only the final *ת* remains of the word *מנחות*. Newsom 1985: 372 suggests restoring this word or *לעשות* (“works”). The former restoration is followed by *DSSSE* 1218–19 and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 356. Davila 2000: 158 makes no attempt to restore the text.

human worshippers.”³⁴⁹ The notion of a sacrificial cult going on in heaven, with angelic priests offering animal sacrifices, is difficult to comprehend, and seems to have grown out of an understanding of a heavenly temple corresponding to the earthly temple, with a heavenly cult in which angels who are priests “provide a platonic ideal for the activities of the priests in the temple below.”³⁵⁰

Conclusion

Barker claims that the Sabbath Songs “must alter forever what we understand as the background to Revelation or Hebrews.”³⁵¹ While Barker may have overstated the case for Hebrews, angels are prominent in Heb 1–2, and human participation in angelic worship surfaces in Heb 12:22. There also, the human community is earthbound, but somehow has access to the heavenly Jerusalem where this worship takes place. Thus, both texts are concerned, albeit implicitly, with the relationship of the community to the heavenly temple.

There are several references to aspects of the heavenly/eschatological temple in both texts. Both refer to the dwelling place of God as a tent/tabernacle; both refer to a curtain and to a throne or thrones; and the words for “pattern” or “structure” (תבנית, τύπος) appear in both texts. The Sabbath Songs provide evidence that the community in the Judean desert, or at least some members of it, had (virtual) access to the heavenly dwelling place of God, a suggestion that also appears in Hebrews. Scholars have made similar claims for both texts with respect to the notion of blood sacrifice in heaven, which is doubtful, and scholars have read both texts with the understanding that there is a heavenly temple above that corresponds in some way to the earthly temple or tabernacle below, which is also doubtful. It would be going beyond the evidence to posit that Hebrews depends on the Sabbath Songs for these ideas. However, that similar ideas surface in two quite different contexts makes it clear that such ideas were current at the time and in the place Hebrews was written. This is not, however, to obscure the very real differences between the two texts, especially in terms

349 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 361. Fletcher-Louis proposes that actual sacrifices were offered at Qumran, as do Humbert 1994: 187–89; Cross 1995: 84–86. For an earlier view arguing that there was no sacrificial activity at Qumran see Baumgarten 1953: 146, 155. Schiffman 1999: 272, and VanderKam 2010a: 135–35, 144–45 are adamant that no sacrifices were offered at Qumran.

350 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 359. The word כִּיּוֹרֵיהֶמָה appears in 4Q287 2 1. Nitzan 1998: 52 reads this as “engraved forms,” while Davila 2000: 69–70 reads it as “lavers,” with the implication that they function in connection with sacrifices that take place in the heavenly sanctuary. While Davila’s reading is technically possible, the scarcity of references to sacrifice in heaven elsewhere makes it unlikely.

351 Barker 1991: 166.

of detail. The Sabbath Songs go into considerable detail on the structure and content of the heavenly temple, something absent from Hebrews, where the concentration is on the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, signalling the arrival of the eschaton. The emphasis and *raison d' être* of each text are quite different.

Conclusion

The fragmentary nature of many of these manuscripts means that definitive conclusions are sometimes difficult. It is clear from 4QmidrEschat^a that the community understood itself in some way to be an interim temple until God himself builds the eschatological temple in the last days, an idea also present in the Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem text. The idea that the community is a temple is also reflected in most of the other texts surveyed here, particularly in those texts where angels are understood to be present in the community, especially in their worship. The presence of the angels requires a degree of ritual purity that is normally associated with the temple as the place where God is encountered. Conversely, and especially in the Sabbath Songs and related texts, the community, or at least an inner core, considered that it was participating in angelic worship. Here the heavenly temple encompasses earth and heaven, so that the community has access to the heavenly temple while still on earth, in the Judean desert. Thus the temple symbolism here reflects the notion that the temple encompasses heaven and earth, and to be in the temple, albeit a temple of humans, involves being present with the angels in heaven. In some texts their worship is considered to be “sacrificial,” the offering of their lips. There is no sure evidence of an understanding of sacrificial activity in heaven, apart from words of praise and thanksgiving.

Temple Contested: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting Dissatisfaction with the Temple

Introduction

In this chapter I examine several texts that reflect dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple. In these texts there is speculation about a heavenly temple that replaces the earthly temple, a phenomenon some have traced to Ezekiel's vision of the departing glory of God due to the corruption of the priesthood (Ezek 10), and Ezekiel's vision of the ideal temple in Ezek 40–48. Since the second temple is not that ideal temple it is not considered to be God's true dwelling place.¹ Dissatisfaction with the temple also surfaces in Hebrews, but for other reasons. I will argue that in Hebrews the temple anticipates the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, and now that Christ has been exalted to God's right hand, the former temple has reached its intended *telos*, and is no longer an effective means of access to God. Thus, both Hebrews and the texts I examine in this chapter are endeavouring to come to grips with a temple and a cult no longer considered effective as a means of approach to God.

Temple language in these texts includes speculation about heavenly journeys, the heavenly temple and the eschatological temple. My concern is with the relationship between the heavenly temple and earthly sanctuaries,² and whether the former was understood as a heavenly archetype of the latter or whether there was some other relationship between them. I will also be alert to signs of dissatisfaction with the temple and to discussions of an eschatological temple where God will ultimately dwell with his people.³

1 Himmelfarb 1993: 10–14 suggests that Ezekiel's belief that the temple was defiled and deserving of destruction (Ezek 9:3–8) is reflected in the vision of Ezek 10:18, where God abandons the temple until the establishment of the ideal eschatological temple in Ezek 40–48, to which God will return. See the discussions in Scholem 1946: 43–45; Stone 1978: 488; Rowland 1982: 84–94; Himmelfarb 1986: 149–51.

2 The plural “sanctuaries” here encompasses the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon's temple and the Second Temple.

3 Barnard 2012: 59 suggests that “in and of itself” the existence of a celestial temple and cult does not imply the rejection of the earthly temple, rather, it may “serve to validate and enhance the glory of the earthly temple.” Barnard concludes, however, “perhaps the most

1 (Ethiopic) Enoch

The composite document known as 1 (Ethiopic) Enoch dates from between the fourth century BCE and the turn of the era.⁴ It comprises five major sections: The Book of the Watchers (1–36), the Book of Parables or Similitudes (37–71), the Book of the Luminaries (72–82), the Dream Visions (83–90) and the Epistle of Enoch (92–105). These are followed by two appendices: the Birth of Noah (106–107), and chapter 108 which recounts an earlier journey of Enoch. Aramaic fragments of parts of 1 Enoch were found at Qumran, indicating that part of the collection was composed in Aramaic and existed in the second century BCE.⁵ The complete collection is now only extant in an Ethiopic translation of an intermediate Greek version.⁶ Temple symbolism surfaces in the Book of the Watchers, the Book of Parables, the Animal Apocalypse (85–90) and the Apocalypse of Weeks.⁷

The Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36)

The Book of the Watchers (BW) comprises an introduction containing an oracle of judgement (1 En. 1–5); an ancient work dealing with the rebellion of the angels (watchers) recounted in Gen 6:1–4 (6–11); an account of Enoch's heavenly journey and his commissioning by God to deliver an oracle of judgement to the fallen watchers (12–16); and a record of other cosmic journeys undertaken by Enoch (17–36).

obvious reason for this perspective and emphasis is dissatisfaction with the (destroyed and/or defiled) temple in Jerusalem." See also Elior 1997: 223.

4 Nickelsburg 2001: 1.

5 Kvanvig 1988: 95–96. The Qumran MSS are 4QEn^a, 4QEn^b, 4QEn^c, 4QEn^d, 4QEn^e. For summaries of their contents see Milik 1971: 336–37; 1976: 6; García Martínez 1992: 46–47; Flint 2005: 224–33; Knibb 2007a: 32–33. The Qumran Aramaic MSS are very fragmented, and Milik's *editio princeps* contains numerous restorations, which are at times difficult to distinguish from the actual manuscripts (Barr 1978: 518–19; Bhayro 2005: 53). Parts of the Book of the Watchers, the Astronomical Book, the Dream Visions and the Proto-Epistle of Enoch (for this designation see Boccaccini 1998:104–13) are represented at Qumran. The rest of Epistle of Enoch and the Book of the Parables are absent. For the relationship between the Aramaic and the Greek manuscripts see Larson 2000: 434–44.

6 Black and VanderKam 1985: 1–7; Nickelsburg 2005: 44; Knibb 2007a: 25–26, 29.

7 In the following discussion I refer to the Greek text of 1 Enoch in Black 1970 supplemented with the Aramaic witnesses from Qumran where available, and to the English translation of Nickelsburg and VanderKam where the only extant witnesses are in Ethiopic. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

The story of the rebellion of the angels recounted in Gen 6:1–4 is central to BW. Both Suter and Nickelsburg have argued that in BW this is to be understood against the background of dissatisfaction with and polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood because of marriages with “foreign” women from non-priestly families,⁸ jeopardising priestly and temple purity.⁹ In BW, Enoch accesses the heavenly temple not from Jerusalem, but from a location near the ancient rival shrine of Dan at the base of Mount Hermon in the far north. This is as far away from Jerusalem as possible,¹⁰ and thus sidelines Jerusalem and the temple. While some of the details are debated, it seems clear that both the setting of the revelation outside Jerusalem, and the presentation of Enoch as a priest in the heavenly temple, imply some critique of the temple and its priesthood.¹¹

The Introductory Theophany

In 1 En. 1:2 Enoch reports a vision of “the Holy One and of heaven” (τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), accompanied with a theophany (1:4–9) introducing an oracle of judgement against the wicked (2:1–5:9). This sets the tone for the entire book, concerned as it is with the origin and outcomes of sin in the world.¹² Enoch announces that God, will come “from his dwelling place” (ἐκ τῆς κατοικίσεως

8 Suter 1979a: 119–24; 2002: 137–42; 2007: 195–207. Nickelsburg 1977: 91–92, 96–97; Wright 2007a: 172–76; Wardle 2010: 53–56. Nickelsburg 1981a: 584–87; 2005: 51 points to several parallels between the Enoch story and the story of the transgression of marriage rules in Ezra 9–10. Other texts reflecting these concerns include Neh 10:30; CD V 6–7; Pss. Sol. 8:11–13; T. Levi 2–7; Jub. 30:7–17; 1QS VII 5–9; IX 5–6.

9 This theory has not met with universal acceptance. For a variety of views see Himmelfarb 1993: 20–23; 1999b: 6–12; 2002: 131–35; 2007: 219–28; Tigchelaar 1996: 195–203; 2002a: 143–44; Collins 1982: 111; 1998: 49–51, 59; Boccaccini 1998: 184; 2005: 6; Sacchi 2005: 402; Reed 2005: 63–66; Horsley 2007: 161, 242. Esler 2014 argues that the theory is without evidence and is untenable. Esler’s findings will form part of a forthcoming monograph, which I have been unable to incorporate in my own work.

10 Nickelsburg 1981a: 582–87; Kvanvig 2009: 169. For Hermon as a rival shrine see Eshel and Eshel 2002: 118–20.

11 Himmelfarb 2006: 20 argues that the temple as an institution is not denigrated in BW, although its affairs may not have been conducted in a fitting manner. However, that the temple is ignored is significant. Hebrews, as well as much of the literature discussed in this chapter, mentions neither Jerusalem nor the temple, but it is unwarranted to infer from this a lack of interest in these central institutions of Judaism. Given the centrality of the temple in Second Temple Judaism, the silence is too loud to be ignored.

12 VanderKam 1973: 131. The theophany announces that God will come to judge the wicked, and his coming will result in cosmic disturbances. For similar ideas see Mic 1:3–4; Isa 26:21; Jer 25:30–31.

αὐτοῦ),¹³ “from the heaven of heavens” (ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν)¹⁴ and will “tread” (πατέω) upon Mount Sinai.¹⁵ He also appears in strength from his “encampment” (παρεμβολή).¹⁶ In this text God’s heavenly dwelling resembles his encampment with the Israelites in the wilderness.

God is said to come in this way in several OT texts. But, apart from Exod 19:11, God usually comes not to, but from Sinai.¹⁷ In Mic 1:2 God speaks “from his holy temple” (מהיכל קדשו), and in 1:3 “exits” (יצא) his “place” (מקום), “descends” (ירד), and “treads” (דרך) on the “high places” (במות) of the earth, words that seem to be reflected in 1 En. 1:3–4 and the judgement scene that follows.¹⁸ Since God speaks from the temple in Mic 1:2, but descends to the earth in 1:3, the text in Micah reflects the belief that the temple is “heaven on earth,” with God simultaneously in the temple and in heaven from where he descends.¹⁹ However, in

- 13 Κατοίκησις appears in 3 Kgdms 8:30 and 2 Chr 6:21 in apposition with οὐρανός for God’s dwelling place. The Hebrew text in 1 Kings 8:30 is אל מקום שבתך אל השמים (“to your dwelling place, to heaven”), and in 2 Chr 6:21 ממקום שבתך מן השמים (“from your dwelling place, from heaven”). Column 1 of 4QEn^a is badly damaged and little of the description of the theophany has been preserved. See Milik 1971: 335–37; 1976: 141–45; *DSSSE* 398–401. *DSSSE* 398 restores ... מן דורה (“from your dwelling”) in 4QEn^a 1 5. In Dan 2:11 מְדוּרָה denotes the dwelling of the gods (אלהין), which is not with mortals.
- 14 That is the highest heaven. For similar expressions see 2 Chr 2:6 (MT and LXX 2:5); Ps 68:33 (MT v. 34, LXX 67:34); Ps 148:4; Neh 9:6. While this is the highest heaven, there is only one heaven in 1 Enoch. The expression is probably hyperbolic (VanderKam 1973: 134; Collins 1995a: 62).
- 15 VanderKam 1973: 136 and Nickelsburg 2001: 145 suggest that πατέω probably translates דרך (see Mic 1:3). The LXX of Mic 1:3 has ἐπιβαίνω (“set foot on,” see BDAG 367).
- 16 The expression ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτοῦ in v. 4 parallels ἐκ τῆς κατοικήσεως αὐτοῦ in v. 3 and refers to God’s heavenly dwelling. Nickelsburg 2001: 145 argues that παρεμβολή should be rendered with “host” (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 20 translate with “army,” see BDAG 774, s.v. παρεμβολή, 3), that is, God’s heavenly entourage. Both Nickelsburg (p. 142), and VanderKam 1973: 138–39 note that the Ethiopic version refers to God’s army, and Milik 1976: 142 restores [עם חילה ר]בָּה (“with his mighty army”) in 4QEn^a 1 6. Barr 1978: 521 notes the meagre evidence for this reconstruction and also that חיל is never rendered by παρεμβολή in the LXX. He proposes restoring מִשְׁרֵי, “the common Targumic word for ‘camp,’” suggesting that this word could have the sense of God “appearing from his abode” (italics original). Charles 1912: 6 translates the word with “camp.”
- 17 Deut 33:2; Ps 68:7–8, 17–18 (MT 68:8–9, 18–19, LXX 67:8–9, 18–19); Hab 3:3. See VanderKam 1973: 132–33.
- 18 Ibid.: 134. See also Deut 33; Judg 5; Hab 3.
- 19 For similar ideas see Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8; 2 Chr 6), where, while God is resident in the temple, Solomon prays that God will hear from his dwelling place in heaven. Otzen 1984: 199–215; Smith 1984: 17; McKane 1998: 29; Andersen and Freedman 2000: 162; Waltke 2007: 47 all believe that the היכל קדשו (“his holy temple/

1 Enoch, God's heavenly dwelling place reflects not the Jerusalem temple but the wilderness encampment of the Israelites. And the temple of Mic 1:2 has disappeared from view. God's dwelling place is no longer connected with the temple, and God's appearance is from the highest heaven where God dwells. Thus at the outset of the book the temple has been displaced in favour of God's heavenly dwelling place.²⁰

The Sanctuary in Heaven (1 Enoch 9:1)

The Greek text of 1 En. 9:1 records that "from heaven" (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) the four archangels saw much bloodshed on earth. There is considerable damage to both 4QEn^a IV 7 and 4QEn^b III 7, but Milik restores in both manuscripts the words "they looked down . . . from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth" (אדיק . . . מן קדשן שמיא על ארעה).²¹ Confirming this is the papyrus fragment XQpapEnoch,²² which reads קדשן שמיא על ארעה ("... the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth"). The text reflects such texts as Deut 26:15 where YHWH is asked "to look down from his holy dwelling, from heaven" (אֵל טוֹט אוֹרָנוֹס טוֹט אָלֶס אֵל טוֹט אוֹרָנוֹס) and bless his people.²³ The text implies a holy dwelling place (sanctuary) above the earth where God dwells with his heavenly entourage, and

palace") of Mic 1:2 is in heaven. However, that is not at all clear. While YHWH exits his place (מקום) and descends (יֵרֵד) in v. 3, in v. 2 he is simply a witness against the peoples of the earth from his holy temple, and there are no verbs conveying movement. Hillers 1984: 19–20 sees a primary reference to heaven, but cautions against distinguishing "too sharply between a heavenly and an earthly temple," comparing Amos 1:2; Isa 6:6. Ben Zvi 1998: 109–10 argues that the text is intentionally ambiguous and may be "(re-)read as indicating a heavenly temple, the Jerusalem temple, or both," noting that the "ambiguity conveys a close association between the divine (sic) and the earthly temple."

20 In Micah, God dwells in Solomon's temple, but by the time of 1 Enoch that had been destroyed and the second temple built. In line with the rest of BW, the second temple is not mentioned.

21 This is Milik's reading of 4QEn^a I IV 6–7. All that remains in 4QEn^b I II 7 are parts of two angelic names. See Milik 1976: 157–59, 170–71; *DSSSE* 402–3; Olson 2004: 35. The Greek version attested in Syncellus reads παρῑστατο ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ("they leaned over to look from the sanctuary of heaven"), but these words are not present in the Ethiopic version (Black 1970: 23; Bhayro 2005: 78). Bhayro considers that Milik's reconstruction "would appear to confirm . . . [the reading preserved in Syncellus] as original" (p. 162). Stuckenbruck 2000: 18 translates "peered down from among the hol[y]one[s] of heaven]," but the Aramaic text for this reading would probably be מִבִּין (from among) rather than מִן (from), see Eshel and Eshel 2005: 146.

22 Eshel and Eshel 2005: 146, 151.

23 See also Ps 14:2; 53:2; Isa 63:15; Bar 2:16; 1 En. 15:3.

from where he and they can view the earth. Thus heaven is understood as God's temple.²⁴

Enoch's Heavenly Journey (1 Enoch 12–16)

The Myth of the Fallen Angels (1 En. 6–16) is foundational to BW and may be its oldest part.²⁵ It is a composite work,²⁶ supplementing the events recounted in Gen 6:1–4, where the watchers descended from heaven, had sexual relations with human women and taught them previously unknown secrets.²⁷ These events are portrayed as the cause of all evil (7:3–4),²⁸ since the offspring of these illicit unions were giants who wrought havoc throughout the world. On seeing this evil, the four heavenly archangels ask God to intervene (9:1–11), and God responds by giving each a commission (10).

Although 1 En. 12–16 follows 6–11 in BW, it is apparent that the two sections were originally independent.²⁹ Enoch is the chief character of chapters 1–5, but he does not feature in chapters 6–11 and is introduced as though for the first time in 12:1–2. Chapters 6–11 are a third person description of events in heaven, while chapters 12–16 are mostly in the first person. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that the author of 12–16 had at least some parts of 6–11 at his disposal, and created 12–16 as a response,³⁰ reiterating and reinterpreting 6–11.³¹

24 See the discussion in Barnard 2012: 56–57.

25 Nickelsburg 2005: 47; García Martínez 1992: 65; Olson 2004: 10. Milik 1976: 25–28 dates BW in the third century BCE, but argues that it incorporates a much older source comprising 1 En. 6–16, which predates the same version of the story in Gen 6:1–4, while Nickelsburg 2005: 48 suggests that it is an elaboration of Gen 6:1–4. Kvanvig 2004: 169–83 concludes that the relationship is complex, and that Gen 6:1–4 and 1 En. 6–16 need to be read in dialogue with one another. For an early date for this section see Stone 1978: 484, 491; Himmelfarb 1986: 147–48; 1993: 10, 116 (note 3); Sacchi 1990: 61; Olson 2004: 7; Kvanvig 2004: 167–83.

26 Bhayro 2005: 11–20.

27 For a convenient summary of 1 En. 6–11; 12–16 see Kvanvig 2004: 163–65.

28 Boccaccini 1998: 72.

29 The Hebrew fragments of the Book of Noah (1Q19bis 19), which preserve fragments from 12–16 but not 6–11, indicate that they were originally independent (Milik 1955b 99; Dimant 1978: 333, note 3). Aramaic Enoch (4Q201, 4Q202) provides evidence that both sections (and indeed all of 1–36) were part of the same document. Thus, they were joined at an early stage, and should be read in that context (*ibid.*: 323; Collins 1978: 315–19; Newsom 1980: 312–20; Nickelsburg 2001: 232; 1978: 311).

30 Newsom 1980: 315–16, 329.

31 Nickelsburg 2001: 229. See also Suter 1979a: 119; Tigchelaar 1996: 154–57; Reed 2004: 53–54. Newsom 1980: 329 and Collins 1982: 96–97 suggest that chapters 12–16 are transitional,

In these chapters, Enoch is a central figure. He recounts his interaction with the fallen watchers and his ascent to heaven. He becomes “the great intermediary of salvation”³² who enters the presence of God, intercedes for the fallen watchers, receives a commission from God and announces God’s judgement on the watchers. All this is to save the inhabitants of the earth from the disastrous outcomes of the unions between the watchers and human women.

After an editorial pericope (12:1–2) introducing Enoch, said to have been taken by God prior to the events of chapters 6–11,³³ the material falls into four main parts. (1) Enoch is sent to the fallen watchers to declare a sentence of judgement passed against them, which he does (12:3–13:3); (2) the fallen watchers ask Enoch to write a petition and intercede for them, whereupon he goes to the waters of Dan, to the south-west of Hermon³⁴ and recites the words of the petition until he falls asleep (13:4–7); (3) while sleeping he has a visionary experience (13:8) in which he undergoes a journey to the heavenly throne room (13:8–15:1); from where (4) God gives him an oracle of judgement to deliver to the fallen watchers (15:2–16:4).

preparing the way for Enoch’s cosmic journeys in 17–36, which along with 12–16 are recounted in the first person.

32 Sacchi 1990: 59.

33 The Greek verb translated “taken” is the aorist passive of λαμβάνω, equivalent to לקח in Gen 5:24. LXX uses μετατίθημι (“translated” from one place to another—i.e. from earth to heaven, see BDAG 642, s.v. μετατίθημι, 1). Hebrews 11:5 reflects the LXX, also with μετατίθημι. Nickelsburg 2001: 233 notes that Gen 5:24 refers to Enoch’s disappearance at the end of his life, while 1 En. 12:1–2 refers to “the beginning of a period of his association with the angels (οἱ ἄγγελοι, 12:2).” The Hebrew morpheme מַלְאָכִים in Gen 5:22, 24 is ambiguous and appears to have been read by these who composed BW as a reference to divine beings. See Dimant 1983: 21; VanderKam 1984a: 130–31; 2001: 133–34; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 146; Kvanvig 2004: 171–73.

34 The location is further elaborated in 13:9 where it is specified as being ἐν Ἐβελσατά which may be a corruption of Abel-Main, perhaps the same location where Levi began his visionary heavenly journey, see Milik 1955c: 403–5; 1976: 196; De Jonge 1974: 138; Nickelsburg 1981a: 582–90; 2001: 248, 250. Eshel and Eshel 2003: 458–68 dispute the geographical connection with the Levi vision, and Nickelsburg 2003: 469–71 seems to agree, a modification of his earlier stance (see also 2005: 413, fn. 19). Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 137 suggest that Eshel’s proposal “remains in the realm of hypothesis,” but do agree that the Hermon location for Levi’s vision is unlikely. Much earlier, Charles 1906: 35 suggested that Ἐβελσατά was a corruption of Ἀβελίγη, a suggestion that Knibb 1978: 2: 94 considers plausible. See also Charles 1912: 31 and Horsley 2007: 241–42 (note 26).

The Waters of Dan and the environs of Hermon are significant religious sites, ideal for a vision such as this.³⁵ From here the winds make Enoch fly, lift him upwards and bring him to heaven (14:8).³⁶ The implication is that, somewhat like Bethel where Jacob has a visionary experience and describes his location as “the house of God and the gate of heaven” (Gen 28:10–17), and like Sinai in Exod 24:9–18 where Moses has an encounter with God, this sacred location is the axis between earth and heaven.³⁷

Heaven is twice described as a sanctuary in this part of BW. In 12:4 the watchers are accused of forsaking “the highest heaven, the sanctuary of the(ir) eternal station” (τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλόν, τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως τοῦ αἰῶνος).³⁸ Later, when Enoch enters the throne room, God asks the fallen watchers through

35 Milik 1955c: 405; Nickelsburg 1981a: 582–87; 2001: 238–47; Black and VanderKam 1985: 144; Eshel and Eshel 2002: 118–20; Carlsson 2004: 36–37; Olson 2004: 42. The region is an ancient religious location, with significant cultic connotations.

36 This part of 4QEn^c is badly damaged. Column VI 21 reads *וּלְעֹלָה וְאוֹלֹנִי וְאֶעֱלֶנִּי* [... on high. And they brought me and placed me in [heaven]”). The Greek text reads *ἐξεπέτασάν με καὶ ἐπήρᾶν με ἄνω καὶ εἰσήνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* (“caused me to fly and lifted me upward and brought me into heaven”). For the sense of “spreading wings in flight” for *ἐκπετάννυμι* see BDAG 307; *LSJ* 516.

37 Bautch 2003: 61. This is also the place to which the fallen watchers descend in 1 En. 6:6. In 1 En. 14:8–23 heaven has a preponderance of snow and ice. As Nickelsburg 2001: 261 notes, “... many of ... [the features of heaven] are compatible with the appearance of Mount Hermon and the conditions that surround it; a massive snowcap, ice, heavy clouds, fierce winds, and terrible cold at its peak.” This is not to suggest that Bethel, Hermon or Sinai constitute the heavenly temple, but these sacred mountains are where God is encountered and in some sense act as “temples.” Neither Jacob nor Moses experienced a heavenly ascent like Enoch did (Rowland 1979: 137–42; Himmelfarb 1993: 9–14), even though they encounter God at these sacred places. For Sinai as a temple see Freedman 1977: 46–67; 1981: 20–29; Levenson 1985: 19–23; Houtman 2002: 3: 294, and for Jacob’s staircase see Rowland 1984: 498–507; Hurowitz 2006: 436–48.

38 Black and VanderKam 1985: 143 note that the expression τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως is unparalleled and suggests that *στάσις* may reflect *מקום* comparing Isa 26:1; Mic 1:3; 1 Kings 8:30; 2 Chr 6:20. See also Charles 1912: 28; Olson 2004: 42–43. See *LSJ* 1634, s.v., *στάσις* B.2, for the sense of “a place where one stands.” Burkitt 1913: 68 translates “the sanctuary of the eternal covenant,” reconstructing a putative Aramaic text from the Greek text used by Charles, with reference to the Targums to Gen 9:16, which refer to the bow that YHWH promises to place in the clouds, as a sign of the “eternal covenant” (*קִים עֲלֵם*, Tg. Ps.-J. and Tg. Onq. Gen 9:16; *קִיִּים עֲלֵם*, Tg. Neof. Gen 9:16). Knibb 1978: 2: 92 suggests that this emendation is plausible. However, there seems little justification for rendering *στάσις* with covenant. In 4Q491c 11 the speaker claims that “my station is with the gods” (*עִם אֱלֹהִים*), and 4Q405 23 11 7 refers to the “station” (*מַעְמָד*) of the holy ones, showing that the notion of a standing place in the heavenly temple is not unknown elsewhere.

Enoch, why they had forsaken “the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary” (τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλὸν τὸν ἄγιον τοῦ αἰῶνος, 15:3). The appositional expressions here indicate that the text envisages heaven as a sanctuary.³⁹

1 Enoch 14:8–23 is an account of Enoch’s journey from the time he fell asleep at Dan until he entered the heavenly throne room, and 14:24–16:4 recount his entry to that throne room. He presents his petition to God, who rejects it, responding with an oracle of judgement for Enoch to deliver to the watchers. The account resembles a prophetic call narrative, similar to Isa 6 and Ezek 1–2,⁴⁰ where an enthroned deity appears and speaks to the prophet. But there is one significant difference, for while Isaiah encounters the deity in the Jerusalem temple⁴¹ and Ezekiel sees the open heaven from beside the river Chebar, Enoch ascends to heaven.⁴²

39 Nickelsburg 2001: 271. A possible third reference to the heavenly sanctuary is preserved in 4QEn^c VI 4 (1 En. 13: 8) where the words לשכני עיני לתרעי appear, to which Milik 1976: 193 adds היכל שמיא. He translates (p. 195) “I lifted up my eyelids to the gates of the palace [of heaven].” *DSSSE* 450–51 adopts this restoration in its translation, although the editors do not restore שמיא in the Aramaic text. Nickelsburg 1981a: 584 and Black and VanderKam 1985: 144 also adopt Milik’s reading, although Nickelsburg 2001: 248–49 notes the damage to the text of 4QEn^c and omits the words in question. He suggests that the reading may lie behind the Greek of the Mt Athos addition to T. Levi 2:3, where, before he prays, Levi says τότε τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἤρα πρὸς οὐρανόν (“then I raised my eyes and my face to heaven”). Olson 2004: 43 adds the reference to the gates of heaven in his translation, with no comment on the state of the text. In ALD Levi “enters directly into heaven from the summit of the mountain” (Milik 1976: 196). See 4QLevi^b 1 II 16–18, and my discussion of T. Levi later in this chapter. ALD has affinities with 1 En. 13:7–10, although the immediate context is different (Drawnel 2004: 104; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 67, 139). The text 4QLevi^b is badly damaged, but the wording of what remains is quite different from Milik’s reconstruction. There Levi “sees heaven” (וַחֲזִית ... שמיא), and “the gates of heaven” (תרעי שמיא) are mentioned, although the immediate context is lost. The word היכל (“temple/palace”) does not appear. See Milik 1955c: 404–5.

40 Habel 1965: 309–14 identifies a call narrative tradition where the prophet stands before YHWH in the heavenly temple. He refers to 1 Kings 22:19–21; Isa 6:1–13; Ezek 1:1–3:15. See also Himmelfarb 1993: 10–11; Nickelsburg 1981a: 575; 2001: 254–56; Olson 2004: 46; Horsley 2007: 241 (note 24). Stone 1978: 490 and Nickelsburg 2001: 254 see some influence from Ezek 40–44, but Ezek 1–2 seems to be the major influence, as Nickelsburg’s charts (*ibid.*: 254–56) indicate.

41 Isaiah 6 does not explicitly locate the vision in the Jerusalem temple. But the shaking of the thresholds (v. 4), the references to the house (v. 4) and to the seraphs and the altar (v. 6) imply that Isaiah was in the temple in Jerusalem. See Habel 1965: 310; Oswalt 1986: 176; Wildberger 1991: 263; Goldingay 2001: 58; Childs 2001: 55; Tucker 2001: 102–3.

42 Himmelfarb 1993: 9. See Wheeler-Robinson 1944: 151–57; Cross 1953: 274–75; Nickelsburg 1981a: 576–82; Dean-Otting 1984: 55–57; Levenson 1988b: 53–54; Collins 1995c: 45–46.

While the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple seem to merge for Isaiah who, on entering the temple, encounters God in heaven,⁴³ and while Ezekiel sees God on his chariot throne “above the firmament” (מעל לרקיע),⁴⁴ Enoch leaves the earth and travels to the heavenly temple to receive his commission. Here, dissatisfaction with the temple resurfaces. Of course, as Ezek 8–10 records, Solomon’s temple had been abandoned by God and had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar’s army. And while the second temple would have been standing when 1 Enoch was written, since it was understood to be defiled it was ignored. Enoch’s only option for a commissioning such as this is to ascend to the heavenly temple. Thus, the heavenly temple is not so much a reflection of the earthly temple, as a replacement of it.⁴⁵

After his ascent Enoch moves through what appears to be a heavenly temple.⁴⁶ As Nickelsburg notes:

43 Habel 1965: 310 (note 29); Wildberger 1991: 263 (“to try to distinguish between an earthly and a heavenly sanctuary attempts to make a distinction which the ancient person would never have attempted”); Goldingay 2001: 58 (“[i]n the temple, the symbolism of worship with the incense swirling becomes a vision of the reality the symbolism pointed to”).

44 Nickelsburg 2001: 259 notes the following differences from Ezekiel’s vision: (1) in Ezek 1 the chariot comes to Ezekiel, while in 1 En. 14 Enoch ascends to heaven, (2) Ezekiel sees only the cherubim, the throne with the human-like figure seated upon it, the fire beneath the throne and the ice-like pavement, while Enoch describes the heavenly temple in considerable detail; and (3) Ezekiel is largely passive, while Enoch is the subject of a number of the verbs. Morray-Jones 1998: 401–2 considers these differences to have been overstated. He notes that Isaiah receives the burning coal from God and receives his instructions from God (who is enthroned in the heavenly temple), and Ezekiel also receives his instructions, “not on earth, but above the firmament,” and is later returned to earth. He comments, “[W]hether he [Ezekiel] has been transported to the earthly sanctuary or the celestial throne room is nowhere specified and it is perhaps doubtful whether this distinction would have been very meaningful to the author, for whom the ritual identification of the one with the other was not merely a dramatic metaphor.” The difference between these proposals depends upon the understanding of a temple that is adopted. Morray-Jones works with a paradigm where a temple is “heaven on earth,” so that to enter an earthly temple is to be transported to heaven, while Himmelfarb, Nickelsburg and Dean-Otting work with a paradigm where the heavenly temple corresponds to the earthly, but is removed from it. That Enoch took a heavenly journey indicates that in 1 Enoch heaven is understood as a sanctuary or temple, above and separated from the earth (see 1 En. 1:3; 9:1, 4; 12:4; 15:5).

45 Carlsson 2004: 43.

46 A detailed exegetical treatment of Enoch’s heavenly journey would be a diversion; rather, I simply draw attention to those parts of the text that describe the heavenly temple. For a detailed discussion see Nickelsburg 2001: 257–66.

(1) The palace of the Deity is by definition a temple. (2) Both 12:4 and 15:3 speak of the eternal sanctuary. (3) Language about both the fallen watchers . . . and the angels “who approach” God . . . suggest that at least some of the angels are construed as priests. (4) *Testament of Levi* 2–5 reuses the material in this vision, making explicit reference to Levi’s vision of the heavenly temple.⁴⁷

In 14:9–14a Enoch sees and then penetrates a wall of hailstones and tongues of fire,⁴⁸ from where he sees a “house” (οἶκος). The description of the wall and the house is clearly fantastic. It bears little relation to any aspect of the Jerusalem temple, apart from the use of οἶκος (vv. 10, 13), which often refers to God’s dwelling place in both the OT and the NT.⁴⁹ The wall either corresponds to the outer wall of the temple or perhaps the wall of the heavenly city.⁵⁰

Enoch enters the house and is overcome with fear, falling upon his face. Through an open door he sees a second house (v. 15), “greater” (μεῖζων) than the first, also built of tongues of fire, but indescribable. This is the heavenly holy of holies, where God dwells.⁵¹ The design of the heavenly temple, then, is loosely based on the layout of the Jerusalem temple in that there are two compartments. But there the correspondence ends,⁵² for these seem to be two separate

47 Ibid.: 256. For angels as priests see Davidson 1992: 238–43; Hannah 1999: 32; 44–45, 60–61.

48 See Schäfer 1992: 79–80 for the predominance of fire in the description of heaven in later hekhalot texts, in particular Ma’aseh Merkavah. See also 3 En. 22B: 3 for fire and hail.

49 Gen 28:22; Exod 23:19; 34:26; Josh 6:24; Judg 18:31; 1 Sam 1:7; 1 Kings 6:2, 5; Isa 2:2; 66:1; Jer 7:1, 11; Ezek 40:47–48; Dan 1:2; Amos 7:13; Mic 3:12; Hag 1:8; 1 Chr 9:23; Matt 12:4 (and parallels in Mark 2:26; Luke 6:4); Matt 21:13 (and parallels in Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46); Luke 11:5; John 2:16; Acts 7:47, 49.

50 Black and VanderKam 1985: 146; Carlsson 2004: 39.

51 That God dwells in the greater house indicates that it represents the holy of holies, but the description is speculative rather than reliant on some awareness of the structure of some existing temple or of the wilderness tabernacle. See Gruenwald 1980: 29–37; Rowland 1982: 255; Collins 1998: 54.

52 Himmelfarb 1993: 16 notes that the architectural detail does not correspond to any known earthly temple, suggesting, however, that there need not be a strict correspondence since the heavenly sanctuary transcended that on earth. Newsom 1985: 49 refers to “elusive transcendence” in the descriptions of heaven in the Sabbath Songs from Qumran, and on p. 50 suggests that the structure “described in 1 Enoch 14 is probably that of a temple “with nave and adytum.” Rowland 1979: 140–41 suggests that “there is hardly enough similarity in detail to justify any [sic] but the assumption that the basic outline of the Temple would have been taken by many apocalypists as a reflection of the court of God.” Himmelfarb 1986: 151–52 finds a correspondence in that both the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries have

dwelling rather than concentric areas of increasing holiness.⁵³ The two dwellings seem to deal with the practical issue of where the angels who serve God live, since they are not permitted to enter God's dwelling place.

This second dwelling was more significant than the first. Within it was a "lofty throne" (θρόνος ὑψηλός) upon which "the Great Glory" (ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη)⁵⁴ was seated, and flowing from beneath the throne was a burning river of fire. The description of the lofty throne reflects Isa 6:1 and the rivers of burning fire from beneath the throne, Ezek 47.⁵⁵ There are also wheels and cherubim (Ezek 1:15–21; 10:1–22) and a brief description of the appearance of God.

The angels in the first house correspond to the priests in the earthly temple,⁵⁶ but none was permitted to "enter" (παρέρχομαι, v. 21) the second.⁵⁷ However, the Lord himself calls Enoch and invites him to "approach" (προσέρχομαι, v. 24). An angel takes him to the entrance, from where he is again invited to "approach" (προσέρχομαι, 15:1).⁵⁸ He enters the presence of God to mediate for the fallen watchers, taking on the role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement,⁵⁹

priests, with the angels functioning as priests in the heavenly sanctuary. Gäbel 2006: 78–79 sees no correspondence here between the heavenly and earthly temples.

- 53 Nickelsburg 2001: 264 recognises that one of these dwellings could be within the other, but also considers it paradoxical that this second house is greater than the one in which it stands. The normal rules of logic need not apply in the description of the two houses in 1 En. 14, and a house containing a greater house is no more paradoxical than walls made of hailstones and fire, through which Enoch passes unharmed (Alexander 2006: 77–78). Furthermore, the comparative adjective μείζων need not imply a greater physical size, rather the superior greatness could refer to the importance, rank or dignity, of the house, described as διαφέρων ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλωσύνῃ ("excelling in glory and in splendour and in majesty," v. 16). See BDAG 624, s.v. μέγας, 4; Gruenwald 1980: 32–35; Rowland 1982: 83, 221.
- 54 See T. Levi 3:4. For a discussion of the names for God in 1 Enoch and the echoes here of Exod 24:10–17, Isa 6:1–4, Ezek 1:26–28; 43:1–4 see Dean-Otting 1984: 50–56.
- 55 See also Joel 3:18; Zech 14:8; Dan 7:9–10; Rev 22:1–2.
- 56 Himmelfarb 1993: 20; Carlsson 2004: 42–43.
- 57 There is some tension in 1 En. 14:21–23, where the angels are said to be barred from the second house (v. 21). In v. 22 they are forbidden to "approach" (ἐγγίζω) God, but are then described as those who do approach him (23). Halperin 1988: 81–82, notes the apparent contradiction, where, although they are unable to enter this structure (v. 21), they are perpetually in attendance (vv. 22–23). For ἐγγίζω referring to cultic approach to God, see Exod 19:21, 22; 24:2; Lev 21:21, 23; Isa 29:13; Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 43:19; 44:13; 45:4; Heb 7:19.
- 58 For προσέρχομαι referring to cultic approach to God, see Lev 9:5, 7, 8; 10:4; 21:17, 18, 21, 23, Num 17:5; 18:22; Deut 4:11; 5:23, 27; Jer 7:16; Ezek 44:16; Sir 1:28, 30; 2:1; Heb 4:16; 7:25; 10:1, 22; 12:18, 22.
- 59 Halperin 1988: 82; Wright 2000b: 251; Carlsson 2004: 42–44.

although there is no suggestion that he carries sacrificial blood into the presence of God.⁶⁰ Enoch surpasses the angels in greatness, “because he is addressed individually and is brought near to God.”⁶¹ Nevertheless, his mediation is ineffective. He receives the oracle of judgement for the watchers—they will have no peace (16:4).

In this earliest description of the heavenly temple it is a structure in heaven with two compartments, one greater than the other. It is vertically separated from the earth and Enoch undertakes a heavenly journey to access it. Nevertheless, there is no precise correspondence to any earthly sanctuary, as the pattern upon which the earthly sanctuary could have been modelled,⁶² although precision in dealing with heavenly realities is not always to be expected. God is enthroned in one compartment, while the angels live in another.

Enoch's Cosmic Journeys (1 En. 17–36)

The Book of the Watchers concludes with an account of two cosmic journeys undertaken by Enoch (1 En. 17–36). In 17:1–19:3 Enoch's heavenly guides lead him on a journey to a mountain whose summit reaches heaven (17:2) and then to seven other mountains of precious stones, one of which also had a summit reaching heaven, like the throne of God (18:8). In 21:1–36:4 Enoch covers the same ground in reverse.⁶³ Whatever else can be said on the debated background of these journeys,⁶⁴ it seems clear that they continue the theme of the punishment of the watchers. Since Enoch sees where this will take place, their punishment is certain. On the other hand, there is also a place of blessing for the righteous. Those who suffer can take courage from the transcendent perspective these journeys reveal.⁶⁵

The central peak of the seven mountains with precious stones, whose summit reached heaven and which “resembled God's throne” (ὡσπερ θρόνος θεοῦ), was topped with lapis lazuli, as in Exod 24:10.⁶⁶ This mountain is clearly Sinai.⁶⁷ On his return (24:3), Enoch notes again that the seventh peak rises above the

60 Hebrews 9:11–14 is often read as though Christ took his blood into the heavenly holy of holies. See my discussion of this text in chapter 8 (below).

61 Wright 2000b: 251; Gruenwald 1980: 36–37.

62 Himmelfarb 2007: 221; Calaway 2013: 120 (note 64).

63 Nickelsburg 2001: 25. The two journeys are separated by a list of angelic names and roles (20:1–8).

64 See the various suggestions in Collins 1982: 104–7.

65 Ibid.: 107–9, 1998: 55–59.

66 Lapis lazuli and the other jewels mentioned are also reminiscent of Ezek 28:11–14, reflecting Eden traditions.

67 Kvanvig 2009: 170–71.

others “like the seat of a throne” (ὅμοιον καθέδρα θρόνου). On it, there is a unique tree that is clearly the tree of life (24:6–25:7). In 25:3 Enoch’s angelic guide (now Michael, 24:6) explains that this mountain is “like the throne of God” (ὁμοία θρόνου θεοῦ) and is the “seat” (καθέδρα) to which God will descend when he visits the earth with goodness.

From there, Enoch proceeds to the centre of the earth where he sees “a holy mountain” (ὄρος ἅγιον, 26:2), surrounded with rivers and filled with trees, and a cursed valley alongside it. This holy mountain is Zion,⁶⁸ and the city is the New Jerusalem alongside the Valley of Hinnom.⁶⁹ Then, in 25:5–6, the tree of life on the high mountain is “transplanted to the holy place beside the house of God” (μεταφυτευθήσεται ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ παρὰ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ). Thus the New Jerusalem supersedes Sinai as the dwelling place of God, and is the place where God reigns forever. The present Jerusalem is simply ignored.

Mountains are prominent in this part of 1 Enoch. Sinai and Zion are identifiable, but not the other mountains, since Enoch’s angelic guide is revealing heavenly things.⁷⁰ Like Hermon in 13:7 and Sinai in 1:3–4, Zion is associated with God. Its location at the centre of the earth, the presence of the tree of life, and the lapis lazuli are reminiscent of the Eden traditions, in particular those connected with Ezek 28, and reflect temple imagery.⁷¹ The imagery of Eden combined with Zion, as well as the allusions to the final judgement, inform the reader of the continuity between Eden and the New Jerusalem. In the eschaton the conditions of Eden will be restored.⁷²

In 1 En. 1–16 the temple is ignored. God is not encountered in Zion; rather he is encountered in the far north and in the heavenly temple. However, in 1 En. 17–36 Zion is the place to which God will return in the eschaton to judge the wicked and bless the righteous. The text anticipates the eschatological dwelling place of God in the New Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there is no earthly structure in BW that can be referred to as a temple. Temple symbolism is reflected in the holy mountains that serve as setting-off places for heavenly journeys and as the place where celestial travellers and angels return to earth, and in the ultimate reign of God over his people.

68 Collins 2004a: 303; Kvanvig 2009: 171.

69 Donaldson 1985: 59–60. Several attempts have been made to map Enoch’s cosmic journeys and locate the different mountains. See the diagrams in Grelot 1958: 46; Milik 1976: 40; Stock-Hesketh 2000: 30; Bautch 2003: 185. All four maps place Jerusalem/Zion at the centre of the earth.

70 Rowland 1982: 124–25; Collins 1982: 104, 108–9; Davidson 1992: 62–66.

71 Grelot 1958: 38–44.

72 Suter 2007: 207.

The Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90)

1 Enoch 83–90 contains two visions. The first (83–84) details the imminent flood and the second is an allegory of the history of the world from creation to the eschaton (85:3–90:41). Human beings are depicted as animals, fallen angels as fallen stars, and the seven archangels as human beings.⁷³ The date of this part of 1 Enoch is disputed, but allusions to the Maccabean revolt indicate that it was written in Judea probably around 165–160 BCE.⁷⁴

Egypt and the Exodus and wilderness wanderings are covered in 89:28–38. This part concludes with the death of Moses, “a sheep that changed and became a man” (89:36), that is, attained angel-like status,⁷⁵ and built a house for the sheep.⁷⁶ Since all the sheep dwell in the house, the referent is probably the wilderness camp.⁷⁷ Here, both the tabernacle and the surrounding camp are the place where God and his people dwell together. In 89:40 the same house is in the midst of the people in their pleasant land, an allusion to the tabernacle and camp at Shiloh.⁷⁸

73 Nickelsburg 2005: 83.

74 Charles 1912: 206–8; Tiller 1993: 61–82; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 361; Olson 2004: 204–6. The events portrayed in 1 En. 90:9–16 are connected with Judas Maccabeus and are followed by a vision of the eschaton. The *terminus ad quem* is decided by 4QEn^f, which contains 1 En. 86:1–3. Milik 1976: 244 dates 4QEn^f around 150–125 BCE, while Beyer 1994–2004: 228 proposes a slightly later date, around the end of the second century BCE. Tiller 1993: 61 follows Beyer as well as a private communication from F. M. Cross who suggests that it cannot be earlier than 100 BCE. The *terminus post quem* is around the time of Judas Maccabeus since events at that time seem to be reflected in 90:9–16 (Tiller, pp. 62–63).

75 Nickelsburg 2001: 375; Porter 1983: 53; Tiller 1993: 259, 295–96 all note that the depiction of Moses as a sheep that becomes a man (see also 89:1, 9 where Noah is depicted as a bull that becomes a man) indicates that Moses attains angel-like status. See also Sir. 45:2; 4Q374 2 II 6; 4Q377 1 recto II 1–12. In 1 En. 67:2 angels build the (Noah's) ark. Dillmann 1853: 257 and Charles 1912: 190 suggested that he became a man so as to perform the human task of building, but since sheep build a house in 89:72 this is unnecessary.

76 4QEn^c 4 10 reads ... והוא אנוש ועבד [א]מר[א] דן אתהפך (‘‘the sheep which was changed, and it was a man and built ...’’). Milik 1976, Plate XIV shows traces of the initial letter of another word after ועבד, which Milik (p. 206) judges to be ב, restoring מ[שכן] (‘‘tabernacle’’), followed by Black and VanderKam 1985: 76–77, 267; DSSSE 418–19; Suter 2007: 208. The damaged letter could be ה, making בית (‘‘house’’), a reading adopted by Knibb 1978: 2: 206; Tiller 1993: 291; Nickelsburg 2001: 369; Olson 2004: 196–97.

77 Nickelsburg 2001: 381–82; Dimant 1982: 177–93. Wardle 2010: 62 argues that the referent is the tabernacle.

78 Tiller 1993: 301. See Josh 18:1, 9.

1 Enoch 89:39–50 covers the entrance into the land under Joshua, the period of the judges, and the activities of Saul, David and Solomon. It culminates with the building of a house (Jerusalem), which contained a high tower, upon which the Lord of the sheep stood with a table spread before him (89:50).⁷⁹ The tower is Solomon's temple and the spread table represents the sacrificial offerings.⁸⁰ That the Lord himself stands on it reflects the glory of YHWH inhabiting Solomon's temple (2 Chr 7:1–3),⁸¹ portrayed in an entirely positive light.

1 Enoch 89:50–65 recounts the history of God's people up to the exile. Everything deteriorates from the time of the dedication of Solomon's temple,⁸² until in 89:66–67 the tower and the house are destroyed and the exile ensues. In 89:72 three sheep return and rebuild the tower.⁸³ This rebuilt tower had a table that had polluted bread on it, and is only "called the high tower." Moreover, God is not said to stand on it. Here, the allegory betrays dissatisfaction with the second temple and its associated cult.⁸⁴ Moreover, the sheep are blind and cannot see (89:72), a reference to the ritual impurity of the priesthood.⁸⁵ The second temple is portrayed in an entirely negative light.

This detail about houses and towers is essential background for two other references to a house and a tower. In 90:28–29 the rebuilt house is removed

79 Dillmann 1853: 262–63; Tiller 1993: 37–38, 312–14; VanderKam 1995a: 117; Nickelsburg 2001: 384; Black and VanderKam 1985: 269; Olson 2004 198. Jerusalem is referred to as a house as in Tob 1:4 (BA text tradition); T. Levi 10:5. For a full discussion of the temple and associated images in the Animal Vision of Enoch see Tiller 1993: 36–51, who relies to a considerable extent on Dimant 1982 (in Hebrew and not seen by me). Tiller concludes from the imagery of a house to signify both the wilderness camp and Jerusalem that, "the author of the *An. Apoc.* seems to accept the halakic equation found in both the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT, that Jerusalem is the camp" (p. 312).

80 Black and VanderKam 1985: 269; Tiller 1993: 314.

81 Nickelsburg 2001: 384; Olson 2004: 198–99.

82 Nickelsburg 2001: 384.

83 Black and VanderKam 1985: 273 identify two of the three sheep as Zerubbabel and Joshua, but are uncertain as to the identification of the third (suggesting Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai or Zechariah). See also Nickelsburg 2001: 394. More plausible is the suggestion that they are three tribes, Levi Judah and Benjamin, see T. Jos. 19:3. Olson 2004: 202 notes that Ethiopic MS EMMI 2080 (fifteenth–sixteenth century) reads "two sheep."

84 Nickelsburg 2001: 394–95; Suter 2007: 208; Himmelfarb 2007: 229; Wardle 2010: 63.

85 Tiller 1993: 340; Nickelsburg 2001: 395. In 89:54 (prior to the exile) the eyes of the sheep were blinded; here they are blinded, they did not see, and neither did their shepherds see. The post-exilic situation is worse than prior to the exile.

and the Lord of the sheep brings a new house and erects it in its place.⁸⁶ Since both the wilderness camp and Jerusalem have already been referred to with the term “house,” this “house” is the eschatological Jerusalem and envisages “a geographic restoration of Israel to Jerusalem.”⁸⁷ All the animals on earth and the birds of the sky come to this house to worship (90:30), and the presence of the Lord is also there (90:34).⁸⁸ Gentiles are now in this house, which becomes large, spacious and very full.⁸⁹

Significantly, this new house has no tower. While some scholars have assumed that the rebuilt house must include a rebuilt tower,⁹⁰ its absence seems deliberate, indicating that in the New Jerusalem there is no temple.⁹¹ Since God dwells within the entire city, it becomes a city-temple.⁹² The house itself is larger and higher than the tower it replaced, with its height indicating its proximity to God.⁹³ As Tiller explains:

The main point is that the New Jerusalem reaches toward heaven and, in fact, becomes heaven in the sense that it becomes the abode of God. The apocalyptic dualism between heaven and earth is resolved.⁹⁴

The absence of a tower in the New Jerusalem indicates a return to a situation analogous to the wilderness, where God and his people dwell together in a house with no tower, a city with no temple (1 En. 89:36).⁹⁵ Solomon's temple

86 For YHWH building a “house,” see Exod 15:17; 4QmidrEschat^a 111 3; 11QTemple xxix 7–10; Jub. 1:17, 26–29; Heb 8:2. In the allegory in 1 Enoch the house is the city, while in these texts it is the eschatological temple.

87 Tiller 1993: 46.

88 Olson 2004: 210 notes that MS M and some of Eth 2 MSS read at 90:29 that “The Lord of the sheep was in the midst of it” (the new house). For a discussion of these MSS see Olson, p. 22. They are dated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and represent the editorial work of Ethiopian clerics who took upon themselves the task of correcting and clarifying the text, often with harmful results.

89 The new Jerusalem and its temple seem to become progressively larger in the ancient traditions, which include this text, as well as Ezek 40–48; 11QTemple LX–LXV; the New Jerusalem scroll (4Q554 1 19–22) and Rev 21:16. For the background to the ideas expressed in this part of 1 Enoch see Isa 2:2–4; 14:2; 66:19–20; Mic 4:1–4; Ezek 37:24–28; Zech 8:23.

90 Dillmann 1853: 284; Black and VanderKam 1985: 278; Wardle 2010: 63–64.

91 Tiller 1993: 46–47; Assefa 2010: 553.

92 Olson 2004: 210; Himmelfarb 2007: 229–30.

93 Nickelsburg 2001: 404.

94 Tiller 1993: 376. Olson 2004: 210 draws a parallel with Rev 21:22. See also Jer 3:16 where the Ark of the Covenant is missing from the new, ideal Jerusalem.

95 Tiller 1993: 48–49; Nickelsburg 2001: 404–5; Suter 2007: 208–9.

is portrayed in a positive light in 89:50, but there is nothing positive about the second temple; it is inferior to the wilderness tabernacle, to Solomon's temple and to the new temple to be constructed by God in the eschaton.⁹⁶

The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:12–17)

The Apocalypse of Weeks (ApW) follows the Animal Apocalypse in 1 Enoch, but predates it, since the Animal Apocalypse refers to the persecution under Antiochus IV and the Maccabean revolt (90:6–12), while ApW does not.⁹⁷ This text analyses the history of the world into ten weeks, each consisting of seven generations.⁹⁸

It is embedded in the Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 91–105),⁹⁹ the place it also occupies in Aramaic Enoch (4QEn^g, 4Q212).¹⁰⁰ In 1 Enoch the weeks are out of order, with weeks one to seven in 93:1–10, the end of week seven in 91:11, and weeks eight to ten in 91:12–17. In Aramaic Enoch, the *Vorlagen* of 1 En. 93:10 and 91:11 occupy consecutive lines, indicating that the weeks originally appeared in numerical order. It is debated whether this transposition was accidental or deliberate, but on balance it seems to have been deliberate, with the eschatological resolution in weeks eight to ten now setting the context in which the perversity of the present generation is to be understood.¹⁰¹

Only significant events are recounted, often in code, and generally at the conclusion of each week. The text has an ethical and religious substructure, with most weeks containing some critique of the wickedness of the people living at the time, and a reference to God's judgement for their wickedness. Significant events include the birth of Enoch (week one), Noah and the flood

96 Wardle 2010: 62–63.

97 Olson 2004: 15–17; Nickelsburg 2001: 440–41. An earlier version of this section appears in Church 2013b: 110–13.

98 Similar divisions of history appear in Dan 9:20–27; Sib. Or. 1, 2 and 4; 11QMelch, 4Q Ages of Creation.

99 I need not enter the debate as to whether it was an earlier text embedded here, or whether it was an integral part of the Epistle of Enoch. See the discussion in Knibb 2005: 213–19.

100 4QEn^g is the earliest witness to ApW, although it is severely damaged, with weeks three to six missing, and weeks two and seven fragmented. It is usually dated to around 50 BCE, see Milik 1976: 246. There is no extant Greek text of ApW, and the complete text is only preserved in Ethiopic. Unless otherwise noted, I quote from Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 140–43.

101 I discuss this “perversity” below. VanderKam 1984b: 511–23, esp. 518, and Olson 1993: 69–91 are among the scholars who propose an accidental reordering of the weeks, while Knibb 2007a: 21–40, esp. 22, and Nickelsburg 2001: 414–15 are representative of those who argue that it was deliberate.

(week two), the election of Abraham (week three), law and tabernacle (week four), Solomon's temple (week five), the destruction of the temple followed by the exile (week six), and a perverse generation and a righteous remnant (week seven). After this the details are vague, with the eschaton anticipated. Most scholars agree that the author belongs to the seventh week, which probably ends somewhere around 175–170 BCE, just prior to the Maccabean revolt, which is not mentioned. The composition is usually dated around this time.¹⁰²

Scholars have noted a concentric structure to ApW,¹⁰³ which begins and ends with enduring righteousness (93:3; 91:17). Deceit and violence arise in the second week (93:4), and vanish in the ninth (91:14). The appearance of Abraham and the plant of righteous judgement (Israel) from whom the plant of righteousness will go forth forever in the third week (93:5) have their counterpart in the building of the eschatological temple for all the generations in the eighth week (91:13). The giving of the law in the fourth week (93:6) contrasts with the perverse deeds of the perverse generation in the seventh (93:9). This leaves the two central weeks, five and six, in which Solomon's temple is constructed (fifth week, 93:7) and destroyed (sixth week, 93:8), followed by the exile.

The sixth week is perhaps the most significant. Here the entire race of the chosen root which will go forth forever (third week) is exiled, the law for all generations (fourth week) is nullified when everyone strays from wisdom, and the temple which was built to last forever (fifth week) is burned with fire. The third to the fifth weeks give the impression of permanence, but it all comes crashing down in the sixth. In the seventh to the tenth weeks this is resolved with the election of the chosen remnant, the building of an eschatological temple, and the revelation of the righteous law to the whole earth.

The stark contrast between the description of Solomon's magnificent temple in the fifth week, as the temple of the glorious kingdom built to last forever,¹⁰⁴

102 VanderKam 1984b: 521–23; Nickelsburg 2001: 440–41; Olson 2004: 16; Stuckenbruck 2007: 61–61. Dexinger 1977: 139 detects references to the Maccabean revolt in the “sword” that appears in the eighth week, and assigns a date after that revolt. García Martínez 1992: 86 argues that the “sword” is more likely to be a reference to the eschatological battle, as in the *Animal Apocalypse* (see 1 En. 90:19).

103 VanderKam 1984b: 518–21; Boccaccini 1998: 107–9. Henze 2005: 207–9 shows that the concentric structure is not completely tidy.

104 As Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 141 (note h) note, Ethiopic *beta* has the sense “house.” Black and VanderKam 1985: 290 suggest that the “house” may also be an allusion to the royal house(hold) of David, following 2 Sam 7:16. That the “house” is burned with fire in 93:8 makes a reference to a physical structure more likely. Their suggestion eases the tension arising from the destruction in the sixth week of the permanent “house” built

and its destruction in the sixth week when the people stray from wisdom, gives it considerable prominence.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, the similarities between this description and that of the eschatological temple in the eighth week indicate that Solomon's temple was seen as the pinnacle of the history, destroyed because of the wickedness of the people. The eschatological temple picks up key features of Solomon's temple, indicating that Solomon's temple foreshadowed the eschatological temple.¹⁰⁶

The wilderness tabernacle appears briefly in the fourth week,¹⁰⁷ but the Second Temple is completely overlooked. There is no return from exile, no rebuilding of Jerusalem and no Second Temple. Just a perverse generation with perverse deeds. The Second Temple looks like an aberration. Nickelsburg describes its absence as "a wholesale condemnation of the return, the restoration, the rebuilding of the temple, and the events of the Persian and Hellenistic periods."¹⁰⁸ This is an argument from silence to be sure,¹⁰⁹ but given the passing reference to the tabernacle in week four, the central place of Solomon's temple in weeks five and six, and the superlatives employed in the description of the eschatological temple in week eight, the silence is surely significant.¹¹⁰ The Second Temple standing in Jerusalem looks like the elephant in the room.

This text, apparently composed while the Second Temple was functioning, completely overlooks it. It venerates Solomon's temple in the past and

in the fifth. But the endurance of the temple was always conditional upon the obedience of the people (1 Kings 9:7; 2 Chr 7:20; Jer 7: 1–15), and the juxtaposition of these two events has considerable rhetorical impact.

105 Nickelsburg 2001: 446, 449.

106 Nickelsburg, *ibid.*: 446–47; Berner 2006: 141. The words **היכל** ("temple"), **מלכות** ("kingdom"), and **כבוד** ("glory"), as well as the notion of endurance, appear in the description of the eschatological temple complementing similar ideas in the description of Solomon's temple.

107 The Ethiopic word is *'atsad* (Nickelsburg 2001: 446). Leslau 1991: 74 defines this word as a "circumscribed area," including a "tent." Charles 1913b: 163 and Olson 2004: 220 render the word with "enclosure," suggesting a reference to Palestine. Isaac 1983: 74 translates "a law shall be made with a fence" and opines that the fence could be around the Torah, as in m. Abot 1.1. A sixth or seventh century CE Coptic fragment of the Apocalypse of Weeks found in Egypt in 1937 contains the word *skēnē* ('tent') at this point. See Donadoni 1960: 197–202 and Milik 1976: 81–82. Those who read a reference to the tabernacle include Dillmann 1853: 295; Black and VanderKam 1985: 290; Nickelsburg 2001: 446; Stuckenbruck 2007: 107–8.

108 Nickelsburg 2001: 447. See also Wardle 2010: 64–65.

109 There is no specific polemic against temple, cult and priesthood, as García Martínez 1992: 89; Himmelfarb 2007: 233–34; Stuckenbruck 2007: 137–38 point out.

110 Nickelsburg 2001: 447–49.

anticipates the establishment of an eschatological temple in the future. This is the fulfilment of God's purposes prefigured by Solomon's temple.

The Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37–71)

Two aspects of the Parables of Enoch (BP) have dominated scholarly debate over recent decades, neither of which is central to this study.¹¹¹ One is the date of the work and the other is the background to the expression "Son of Man" in the NT.¹¹² I make no comment on the second issue, but a brief discussion of the date is necessary.

No consensus has emerged on the date. Probable dependence on Dan 7:13 for the background of the term Son of Man gives a *terminus post quem* sometime after 164 BCE. The *terminus ante quem* is probably the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, since some reference to those events would be expected if they had already happened. The majority of scholars argue for a date somewhere around the beginning of the Common Era and perhaps during the reign of Herod the Great (37–4 BCE).¹¹³

While BP does not mention Torah, temple or cultus, and while there is nothing in the text to indicate Jewish provenance, it does seem to be a Jewish rather

111 1 Enoch 37–71 is also referred to as the Similitudes of Enoch. Both "parables" and "similitudes" are attempts to render the Ethiopic *mešālē* (37:5; 38:1; 43:4; 45:1; 57:3; 58:1; 68:1; 69:29), a word that could also be rendered "(revelatory) discourse" (Jastrow 1989: 862; Nickelsburg 2005: 248). Following Nickelsburg 2007: 23, I use the term "parables." I also note that 37:1 refers to BP as a "vision of wisdom" and that the term "The Book of the Parables" appears in 68:1.

112 Recent studies on the Son of Man in BP include Chialà 2007: 153–78; Kvanvig 2007: 179–215; Collins 2007b: 216–27; Koch 2007: 228–37; Gieschen 2007: 238–49; Oegema 2007: 250–59. In BP an exalted figure, known variously as "Righteous One," "Chosen One," "Anointed One" and "that Son of Man," is enthroned in heaven. In Hebrews the command addressed to the Davidic king to sit at God's right hand in Ps 110:1 is addressed to Jesus (1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12–13; 12:2), also enthroned in heaven. This aspect of BP is peripheral to my study of temple symbolism. I discuss the referent of the term υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ("son of man") in Heb 2:6 in chapter 6, below.

113 Charlesworth 1998: 94–97 detects references to the harassment of the inhabitants of Palestine in the reign of Herod the Great (37–4 BCE) through harsh taxation and land seizures in such texts as 1 En. 43:8; 53:7; 56:6 and elsewhere, and argues that this apocalyptic text is written to encourage God's people with the knowledge that God will ultimately deal with the strong, wealthy people who possess the land (see 62:1, 3, 6, 9; 63:1, 12) by acting to vindicate his people. Sacchi 2006: 386–95 reaches similar conclusions on slightly different grounds. These arguments would fit with the content of BP and this seems as good a date as any.

than a Christian work. Moreover, 1 En. 71:14 identifies Enoch as the Son of Man. The use of this title for Jesus in the canonical Gospels would preclude its application to any figure other than Jesus in a Christian text, and indeed there is nothing in the text that bears any relationship to the life of Jesus.¹¹⁴ Therefore I proceed on the understanding that BP is a Jewish text composed around the turn of the Era. It is only extant in Ethiopic, possibly translated from a Greek translation of an original Aramaic *Vorlage*, although conclusive evidence for this is lacking.¹¹⁵

The book comprises an introduction (37:1–5) and three parable discourses,¹¹⁶ followed by an epilogue (70–71). The introduction imitates the introduction to 1 Enoch as a whole (1 En. 1:1–2),¹¹⁷ although tailored to suit BP. Here, Enoch explains that he had received wisdom in the form of three parables from the Lord of the Spirits.¹¹⁸ The third parable contains nothing of relevance to this study. In what follows I examine the first two separately, followed by a glance at the epilogue.

The First Parable (38:1–44:1)

The first parable concerns the eschatological dwelling places of the righteous and the sinners when the Righteous One appears in the presence of the righteous ones (38:2),¹¹⁹ and when light appears to the righteous and chosen who

114 Knibb 1979: 350–52; Suter 1981: 218; Nickelsburg 2005: 255; Davila 2005b: 132–37. As Davila notes with reference to the similarities between the Parables of Enoch and Matthew, it is understandable that Matthew might use a Jewish apocalypse, but it is hardly likely that a Jewish author would base his work on Matthew. For an argument that BP is a Jewish-Christian work from the first half of the first century see Mearns 1979: 360–69.

115 Knibb 1978: 2: 38–42; 2007a: 27–29; VanderKam 1987: 247–62 Nickelsburg 2001: 15. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations are from Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 50–95.

116 1 En. 38:1–44:1; 45:1–57:3; 58:1–69:29.

117 Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 96–97.

118 This is the usual name for God in BP. It appears in Num 16:22; 2 Macc 3:24. A likely derivation is from the Hebrew expression “YHWH of Hosts” (יהוה צבאות) in Isa 6:3, cited in 1 En. 39:12, see Black 1984: 1: 53–59; Kvanvig 2007: 185–87; Koch 2007: 233; Gieschen 2007: 239. In some places in BP God is also referred to as the Head of Days, as in Dan 7:9.

119 For details of the variant readings in the MSS at this point see Knibb 1978: 2: 125. VanderKam 1992: 170, and Kvanvig 2007: 187 (note 17) argue that the abstract noun “righteousness” is preferable to “the Righteous One” being the *lectio difficilior*, as it results in the strange line “when righteousness appears in the presence of the righteous.” There is also some uncertainty as to whether the Righteous One (if that is the correct reading) is a specific individual or “any righteous person” (Olson 2004: 74). Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 98 (note 8) argue that “the Righteous One” is preferable, especially when compared with 52:6, 9; 53:6.

dwell on earth. It would have been better if the sinners had never been born (38:2) as they will be driven from the earth (38:1). These sinners are the kings and the mighty ones who will be given into the hands of the congregation of the righteous and holy ones (37:5) and whose lives will end.

The eschatological dwelling place of the righteous is detailed in the remainder of the first parable, which is indebted to Enoch's heavenly journey (1 En. 14–16). Enoch describes his ascent to heaven (39:3) and the heavenly temple. While the description in BW is concerned with the geography of the heavenly temple, here the inhabitants of heaven and their worship are in the foreground.¹²⁰ God (the Lord of the Spirits) is present and there are innumerable angels (40:1). Enoch is accompanied by an *angelus interpretes*, who is never formally introduced (40:8), although the four archangels are named in 40:9. The “Chosen One of righteousness and faith” is also there (39:6),¹²¹ before whom the righteous and chosen ones will be forever (39:6).¹²² Enoch sees his dwelling place “beneath the wings of the Lord of the Spirits,” where he himself wishes to dwell (39:8), and he hears the righteous and chosen ones praising the names of the Lord of the Spirits (39:7).

In 1 En. 39:4–5 “the dwellings of the holy ones and the resting places of the righteous” are “with his righteous angels and their resting places with the holy angels.” Here, both the people of God and the angels are referred to as righteous and holy and, ultimately, they dwell together.¹²³ It is clear from the description of the inhabitants, the reference to resting places, the prayers and intercessions of the holy ones (39:5), and the singing of the trisagion, an allusion to Isa 6:3, that the dwelling is the heavenly temple, and the angels are priests.¹²⁴

On his heavenly journey, Enoch sees the righteous dead dwelling with the holy ones and the Chosen One in the heavenly temple (1 En. 39–40). However,

¹²⁰ Nickelsburg 2007: 27.

¹²¹ A textual variant here reads “the chosen ones.” Black and VanderKam 1985: 197 argue from both external and internal evidence for the singular reading, as do Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 111. This epithet appears fifteen times in BP. See VanderKam 1992: 172–74.

¹²² That the exalted individual is the Chosen One and the Righteous One, and that God's people are the chosen and righteous ones, shows that he is their heavenly representative (Collins 1980: 111–33; Nickelsburg 2005: 249).

¹²³ It is not always easy to tell whether the adjective holy refers to the people of God or to the angels in 1 Enoch. The latter seems apparent in 39:1, 5; 47:2, 4; 57:2; 60:4; 61:8, 10, 12; 65:12; 69:13; and the former in 38:4, 5; 39:4; 41:2; 43:4; 45:1 (?); 48:1, 7, 9; 50:1; 51:2; 58:3, 5 (?); 62:8; 65:12. “Holy angels” appear in 46:1; 69:5; 71:1, 8, 9. See Decock 1983: 71; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 100 (notes 23, 24).

¹²⁴ Barnard 2012: 75; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 112.

in the eschaton they appear on earth (38:1–6).¹²⁵ The mighty and exalted who possess the earth in the present will have disappeared, and there will be a reversal of fortunes, so that the righteous ones, who now have a heavenly dwelling place with the angels and the Lord of Spirits, will dwell on the renewed earth.

The Second Parable (45:1–57:3)

This parable begins with a superscription (45:1–2) and a prophetic oracle of judgement and salvation in which God speaks (45:3–6).¹²⁶ According to the superscription, the parable is directed to those who “deny the name of the dwelling of the holy ones and of the Lord of Spirits” (45:1).¹²⁷ These are the practical atheists who harass the people of God as though neither the heavenly temple nor God exist. These will not ascend to heaven, nor will they return to earth (as do the righteous and chosen ones of the first parable); rather, they will be kept for the day of affliction and tribulation. On the other hand, the heavens and the earth will be renewed and God’s chosen ones will dwell on it, with the Chosen One dwelling with them (45:5–6). The eschatological temple can be inferred from the transformation and renewal of the earth, the Chosen One dwelling on earth with the chosen ones, and the chosen ones dwelling in God’s presence (45:6).¹²⁸

Three visions of heaven appear in 1 En. 46; 47–48; 49, followed by a description of an eschatological scenario (51:1–5) and an account of Enoch’s cosmic journeys, where he sees the places of the eschatological punishment of the wicked (52:1–56:4). He sees a deep valley prepared as a place of punishment for the kings and the mighty of the earth (53:1–5), and in 53:6–7 either the angel or Enoch¹²⁹ announces that after their punishment “the Righteous and Chosen

125 While Lee 2001: 61 heads up his treatment of the First Parable as “*heavenly/New Temple/Jerusalem*” (italics original), this parable mentions neither the earthly nor the heavenly Jerusalem, nor any earthly eschatological temple. See the discussion in Hofius 1970b: 63–64; Gäbel 2006: 80.

126 Nickelsburg 2007: 30–31.

127 Black and VanderKam 1985: 204–5 following Eth^{tana} suggest that some of the words in the verse may have been misplaced, and proposes that a more likely reading is those who “deny the Name of the Lord of the Spirits . . . [and the] dwellings (congregations) of the holy ones.” Olson 2004: 87 adopts this reading.

128 Lee 2001: 63.

129 Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 194 confine the angel’s reply to v. 5, and see vv. 6–7 as expansions on the angel’s reply as in 52:7 (“perhaps”); 54:6; 56:4. Charles 1913b: 220 extends the reply to the end of v. 7 while Black and VanderKam 1985: 53 have no closing quotation

One will cause the house of his congregation to appear.”¹³⁰ From then on, God’s people “will not be hindered in the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Cosmic phenomena follow, with the mountains becoming level¹³¹ and the hills becoming like a fountain of water. Then “the righteous will rest from the oppression of the sinners.”

The “house of the congregation” is a reference to the eschatological temple.¹³² The levelling of mountains accompanies the return from exile in Isa 40:3–5. The water is reminiscent of the water flowing out of Ezekiel’s ideal post-exilic temple (Ezek 47:1–12), and the rest of the people from their enemies echoes Exod 15:13–17; 1 Kings 8:56; 2 Chr 6:41. The text anticipates the return from exile.¹³³ This had already happened, with the people in the land and second temple functioning when BP was composed. But the second temple is ignored and the defeat of the rich and mighty still anticipated along with the true return from exile. That will be signalled by the defeat of the enemies and the establishment of the eschatological temple where God’s people will rest.¹³⁴

mark. Olson 2004: 99 breaks off the reply at the end of v. 6 with an ellipsis, understanding v. 7 as the resumption of the angel’s earlier speech in 52:4–9.

130 Black and VanderKam 1985: 53 translate this verse, “[a]nd after this the Righteous and Elect One shall appear, and his congregations from now on shall not be subject to interdict in the Name of the Lord of Spirits.” On p. 209 they note their preference for the Eth^{tana} ms at this point, and that they have construed “his congregations” as a collective singular and as the subject of the verb “shall not be subject to interdict.” This removes any reference to “the house of the congregation.” Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 194, 197 do not refer to any textual variant.

131 Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 67 read “the mountains will be . . . as <wax>,” with the brackets indicating that they have emended the text (note t). For mountains like wax, a metaphor for their levelling, see Ps 97:5; Mic 1:4. See Black and VanderKam 1985: 53, 218; Olson 2004: 100–101. Charles 1913b: 220 reads “the mountains shall not stand as the earth” and in a footnote suggests that this is figurative language referring to “the kingdoms of the earth” not enduring.

132 Charles 1913b: 220 suggests the institution of the synagogue, but this is unlikely. Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 197 refer to “the eschatological community.” See also their note on the plural “houses of his congregation” (46:8), which they identify as “a plurality of religious communities.”

133 On the other hand, mountains like wax and torrents of water also feature in God’s judgement of his people for their sins in Mic 1:2–7.

134 Wright 1992: 299–307.

The Epilogue to the Book of the Parables (70–71)

An epilogue of at least one, and perhaps three, parts follows the third parable.¹³⁵ These chapters comprise an introduction recounting the raising up of Enoch in the third person (70:1–2); followed by an account of Enoch's entry to paradise in the first person (70:3–4); Enoch's ascent to heaven (71:1–4); Enoch's entry to the heavenly temple (71:5–16); and a conclusion to the book (71:17).¹³⁶

In 71:5 the heavenly temple is located in the “heaven of heavens,”¹³⁷ and is described, in what appears to be an allusion to 1 En. 14:9–10, as a house of hail-stones. But while 1 En. 14:9–10 describes the geography of the heavenly temple with two houses, here there is only one house. It is inhabited by innumerable angels, the seraphim, cherubim and ophannim who guard the throne of God's glory (71:5), and the four archangels and the holy angels in the heights of

135 I cannot enter into the critical issues surrounding the authenticity of these two chapters. The somewhat surprising identification of Enoch with the Son of Man in 71:14 indicates to Knibb 1995: 177–80; 2007b: 63; Collins 1992: 453–59; 1998: 190–91; 2007b: 221–27; Kvanvig 2007: 197–210 that they are a secondary addition. On the other hand, VanderKam 1992: 177–85 argues strongly that they are a natural conclusion to the book, corresponding to the introduction in 1 En. 37, and that the questions that have led some scholars to reject them can all be resolved. Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 315 argue for their authenticity on literary grounds. In the absence of any MS evidence pointing to their exclusion, I treat them as an integral part of the text. See the excursus in *ibid.*: 330–32.

136 VanderKam 1992: 177–79. Gruenwald 1980: 38–46 discusses aspects of 1 En. 71 found in later merkabah texts. He notes that there seem to be two separate heavens, the first in vv. 1–4, and the second in vv. 5–17, where heaven is a palace from which God and the archangels emerge to greet Enoch. Suter 1979b: 14–23 notes the importance of the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man in 71:14 for the later merkabah texts where Enoch and Metatron are identified, the significance of the expression “the throne of his glory” here and in later texts, and of the *Qedushah* reflected in 1 En. 39:10–14. Similar features to those found here also appear in the Sabbath Songs from Qumran. Both BP and the Sabbath Songs seem to belong to an early stage of the merkabah traditions. See Eskola 2001: 95–96; Carlsson 2004: 60.

137 As in 1:4 this need not imply a plurality of heavens. Rather, it delineates “the highest part of the heavenly realm” (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 325). Collins 1995a: 66 and Barnard 2012: 60 propose multiple heavens in this text, although Barnard concedes that the text need not be read in this way.

heaven go in and out of the house.¹³⁸ These appear to be performing priestly functions.¹³⁹

As in 1 En. 14:24, Enoch is prostrate until “he” comes and greets him (71:14), announcing that he (Enoch) is the Son of Man, in terms reminiscent of 1 En. 46:3. The identity of the speaker is obscure, and could be either an angel or the Head of Days.¹⁴⁰ More significant for my purposes are the beings that guard the throne (71:5), reminiscent of the cherubim in the holy of holies, guarding the Ark of the Covenant. There are indications in this text that the heavenly temple in the heaven of heavens corresponds in some way to the holy of holies in the earthly temple, and has replaced it as the proper dwelling place of God.¹⁴¹

Conclusion

Temple imagery emerges in BP in its anticipation of the eschatological dwelling place of the righteous in the heavenly temple with God and numerous angels. While this dwelling place is at present in heaven, ultimately it will be on earth, following a reversal of fortunes when the mighty and exalted disappear. The epilogue is a little different, envisaging the heavenly temple as the dwelling place of God in heaven. In the parables and in the epilogue the second temple is overlooked in favour of the heavenly, eschatological temple.

138 Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 326 (note 17) refer to “activity within the house.” Barnard 2012: 58 identifies the house in 1 En. 71 with the second and greater house of 1 En. 14. “i.e. the inner sanctuary and most holy place.”

139 See 1 Sam 2:30, 35 where the role of first Eli, and then a future “faithful priest” are described with similar language.

140 Black and VanderKam 1985: 68 read “that angel,” a reading Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 321 include in a footnote from MSS q 2080² and β. Black and VanderKam 1985: 68 identify the angel as Michael, although v. 13 names four angels (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Phanuel), as well as “thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number” (v. 13). Olson 2004: 134–35 also reads “that one,” noting that “that angel,” appears in “Eth 2, MS Q and marginal corrections in EMML 2080 and 7584.” In their translation, published prior to the commentary Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 95 include “that angel” in the text and note (note d) that “some mss read *and he*.” It is probably not possible to reach a satisfactory conclusion as to which reading is original; that is, whether it is one of the named angels or the Head of Days who addresses Enoch here. See the discussion in Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012: 327–28.

141 Himmelfarb 1993: 13.

Jubilees

Jubilees retells Gen 1–Exod 24,¹⁴² in words claimed to have been revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai during his forty days there with YHWH.¹⁴³ It was written down to ensure correct understanding.¹⁴⁴ The date of composition is debated, but is probably somewhere around the middle of the second century BCE, prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, where several fragmentary witnesses to the text were found,¹⁴⁵ and later than 1 Enoch, since material from 1 Enoch appears in several places and is treated as authoritative.¹⁴⁶ Jubilees was written in Hebrew and translated into Greek and Syriac. The Greek translation was translated into Latin and Ethiopic. The only complete witness to the text is the Ethiopic version. Parts of the Greek, Syriac and Latin versions remain, and the witnesses from Qumran are in Hebrew.¹⁴⁷

-
- 142 Wintermute 1985: 48; Scott 2005: 11; VanderKam 2008: 405. Nickelsburg 1984a: 97 suggests that the narrative ends at Exod 14, while in 2005: 69 he suggests that it ends at Exod 12, as does Charlesworth 1993: 39. The superscription alludes to Exod 24:4, and Jub. 49 deals with the institution of the Passover (following the Exodus). Jubilees 50 contains legal material concerning the Sabbath. On pp. 38–40 Charlesworth includes Jubilees in the category “[e]xegesis by expansion.” He continues, “the biblical stories were . . . taken seriously . . . but to speak to the curiosities and needs of a later time the stories needed to be retold and completed with details . . . It seems obvious that the text was considered divine, but the spirit for interpretation allowed the Jewish exegete to alter, ignore, expand, and even rewrite the sacred Scripture” (p. 39).
- 143 See the “Prologue” to Jubilees; Jub. 1:4–6. In Jub. 1:27–28 (4Q216 IV 6–7) YHWH commands the Angel of the Presence to dictate (הכתִּיב) the content of the revelation, then from Jub. 2 onwards the Angel of the Presence speaks to Moses and commands him to write.
- 144 VanderKam 2008: 409–11.
- 145 VanderKam (1977: 207–85; 2008: 407–9) has an extensive discussion of the date of Jubilees and concludes that it was composed between 161–152 BCE. He argues for this on the basis of allusions to the Enochic Book of Dreams in Jub. 4:17–26 and the palaeographic dating of 4QJub^a. See also Nickelsburg 2005: 73–74; Bergsma 2009: 41–42. For the influence of Jubilees at Qumran see Hempel 2000: 196; Shemesh 2009: 259–60, and for the relationship of BW (and other parts of 1 Enoch) to Jubilees see Boccaccini 1998: 86–98; Bergsma 2009: 45–51; Jackson 2009: 411–25. The Qumran witnesses to Jubilees are 4Q216–4Q224 (4QJub^a–4QJub^g, 4QPapJub^h).
- 146 Nickelsburg 2001: 72. Material from 1 Enoch and about Enoch appears in Jub. 4:15–26; 5:1–12; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:1–17.
- 147 For a discussion of the manuscript tradition see VanderKam 2009: 3–21. In what follows, unless otherwise indicated, I will use Wintermute’s translation of the Ethiopic text. I will refer to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin witnesses where they are available.

To the author of Jubilees, Zion and the Jerusalem temple had been defiled (1:10; 23:21), and await eschatological re-sanctification by YHWH on his return to dwell with his people (1:17; 4:26).¹⁴⁸ Jubilees also implies a temple in heaven where angels approach God in priestly service (31:14). Indeed, several things in Jubilees take place “on earth as in heaven”:¹⁴⁹ God keeps the Sabbath (in heaven) on the seventh day of creation (2:1), as do the angels (2:18);¹⁵⁰ the feast of weeks is kept in heaven (6:17–19); and circumcision has its origins with the angels in heaven. Interestingly, however, the angels who keep the Sabbath, keep it “in heaven and on earth,” indicating some interplay between the two spheres.

Enoch is also an important figure. In a dream vision he sees all that will happen until the Day of Judgement (4:19) and writes it down. After spending an extended period with the angels in heaven who show him everything on earth and in heaven, he testifies against the watchers and is then led back to earth and taken to Eden where he offers incense as a priest (Jub. 4:23–26). In the context of the career of Enoch, Jubilees anticipates the new creation when “the eschatological priesthood that will enter priestly service in the rebuilt temple on Mount Zion in the new creation.”¹⁵¹ Jubilees contains several references to sanctuaries and holy places, mainly at the beginning and the end of the book. I begin with an overview of these and then deal with the notion of Eden as a sanctuary.

The Tabernacle, the Temple and the Eschatological Sanctuary

In the redactional narrative frame of Jubilees (Jub. 1:1–29), God tells Moses to write the history of his people in terms that reflect the Deuteronomic theme of unfaithfulness, followed by exile and ultimate restoration.¹⁵² Jubilees 1:10

148 Ruiten 1999b: 224; Wardle 2010: 60–62. As Ruiten notes, while Jubilees is negative about the temple it speaks positively about the former sanctuary in Eden and the restored sanctuary on Mount Zion.

149 Scott 2005: 1–8 introduces the theme of “on earth as in heaven” in Jubilees. On p. 5 he refers to the plan for the tabernacle in Exod 25–30, which Jubilees omits in order to keep “the primary focus on this trajectory from Enoch to the eschatological temple.” Nevertheless, Scott claims that part of the impetus for the theme “probably” came from Exod 25:9, 40, although this is impossible to verify.

150 Barnard 2012: 141 sees this as an instance where “the ideal earthly cult is . . . regarded as an extension of the heavenly.”

151 Scott 2005: 5. 4Q475 also connects Zion with the renewal of the creation. See Elgvin 1999: 578–91, 2003: 467.

152 Davenport 1971: 24–25; Knibb 1976: 266–60; Ruiten 1999b: 215–27; Scott 2005: 77–79. See Deut 28:15–68; 31:16–29; Lev 26:14–39.

predicts that they will forsake “my sacred place, which I sanctified for myself among them, and my tabernacle and my sanctuary,¹⁵³ which I sanctified for myself in the midst of the land so that I might set my name upon it and might dwell there.” After they repent and return to God, God will restore them from exile and build his sanctuary in their midst, dwell with them and not be alienated from them (1:17). While Charles reads this as a prediction of the second temple,¹⁵⁴ that God himself builds it, indicates that it is the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people.¹⁵⁵

Leviticus and Deuteronomy predict exile for unfaithfulness and subsequent restoration, but they refer in the first instance to the events of 587 BCE and the return from exile. Jubilees applies these texts to the generation of the author and to the pollution of the holy of holies in the present (Jub. 23:21).¹⁵⁶ Jubilees 1:10–17 assures the reader that while the current state of affairs may have been brought about by their own rebellion, it is not permanent. If they repent, God will return to them on the day of the new creation, build a temple and dwell among them on Mt Zion in Jerusalem (1:26–29; 4:26; 49:18), where he will reign forever and ever.¹⁵⁷ These predictions ultimately owe their origin to Exod 15:17–18.

While Noah (Jub. 6:1, 3) and the Patriarchs (13:9, 16; 15:2; 18:1–13; 22:3; 24:23) offer sacrifices on altars in a variety of places, the importance of Zion and Jerusalem is underscored in several places. It is one of the four sacred places on the earth in 4:26, along with Eden, the mountain of the East and Sinai, and is one of the three holy places in 8:19. Furthermore, its importance is implied in the story of Jacob’s dream at Bethel (Jub. 32:16–26). Jacob decides to build walls around the place and “sanctify it and make it eternally holy for himself

153 “Sanctuary” is a translation of מִקְדָּשׁ in 4Q216 11 9. VanderKam and Milik 1991: 225; 1994: 9 render this word with “temple.” The same Hebrew word appears in 4Q216 1V 7, where VanderKam and Milik (p. 12) read “my sanctuary.” The only remaining mark in line 10 of this column is a dot identified by Milik and VanderKam as the tip of a ל, and they restore the words צִיּוֹן וִירוּשָׁלַם (“Zion and Jerusalem”). These lines correspond to Jub. 1:28.

154 Charles 1913c: 11–12.

155 Davenport 1971: 29–31; Knibb 1976: 61; 2007c: 410; Suter 2009: 403–4. For other texts implying that the eschatological temple is in view see Jub. 1:27, 29; 25:21. The pollution of the second temple is “foretold” in 23:21.

156 Davenport 1971: 27; Ruiten 1999b: 217. Scott 2005: 87 and Gäbel 2006: 40–41 relate Israel’s downfall in Jubilees to failure to properly observe the solar calendar. Wardle 2010: 61–62 relates it to sexual impurity on the part of the high priest.

157 Jub. 1:29 seems to predict the renewal of the entire creation. Moffitt suggests, “the created realm becomes like the heavenly realms—a fit place for the eternal, pure, and holy God to dwell”, i.e. a sanctuary that extends to fill the entire earth.

and his sons after him" (32:16). However, in a subsequent vision, an angel shows Jacob heavenly tablets and instructs him not to build, and not to make an eternal sanctuary at Bethel, because "this is not the place" (32:23). Jacob is not told where the place is, but Zion and Jerusalem are no doubt implied.¹⁵⁸

Zion is also implied in Jub. 49:16–21, a pericope that records the institution of the Passover in terms mostly taken from Exod 12. However, the regulations of Deut 16:1–8, where the people are commanded to sacrifice the Passover at the central sanctuary rather than in their homes, are brought into play. In Jub. 49:16–17 Moses is commanded to ensure that it is not eaten "outside the sanctuary of the Lord, but facing the tabernacle of the Lord" (*a sanctificatione domini sed secus tabernaculum domini*).¹⁵⁹ Jubilees 49:18 anticipates the setting up of the tabernacle in the midst of the promised land in one of the tribes, until "the sanctuary of God is built" (*aedificabitur sanctificatio dei*). This text probably refers to Solomon's temple, but ultimately the eschatological temple of Jub. 1:17, 27, 29 is in view, especially in the use of the passive voice to refer to "the house being built in the name of the Lord" (*aedificabitur domus in nomine domini*) in v. 19. In this way, the closing sections of Jubilees anticipate the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon's temple and the eschatological temple.¹⁶⁰ The second temple is overlooked, and the references to Zion and Jerusalem in Jubilees indicate that the anticipated eschatological temple was probably conceived of as physical structure.¹⁶¹

158 Larson 2009: 380.

159 The sense "sanctuary" for *sanctificatio* seems odd. Lewis and Short 1966: 1625 give the sense "sanctification." However, the word appears in the Vulgate of Ps 113:2; Ezek 37:28; Amos 7:13; 1 Macc 1:41; 4 Ezra 10:21 with the sense "sanctuary." The definition "sanctuary" also appears in Stelten 1995: 238.

160 Scott 2005: 131. Later (pp. 207–8), Scott argues that this text "provides a likely scenario" for the return from the exile and the rebuilt temple. This ultimately leads to the goal of history when "everything will become 'on earth as in heaven.'" However, in Jubilees the heavenly temple is only implied by the presence of worshipping angels in heaven. There is no hint of the "on earth as in heaven" with respect to the heavenly and earthly temples, and no suggestion of a physical structure in heaven. See also VanderKam 2008: 425–26.

161 Moffitt 2011: 93–94 proposes that the eschatological temple will encompass heaven and earth, so that "the created realm becomes like the heavenly realms—a fit place for the eternal, pure, and holy God to dwell" (p. 93). He takes this from Jub. 1:19, although he does acknowledge that "the imagery is difficult to interpret."

Eden as a Sanctuary

In Gen 2–3 Eden appears to be a sanctuary,¹⁶² although this is never made explicit. However, Eden is clearly a sanctuary in a variety of places in Jubilees.¹⁶³ Jubilees 3:4–7 recounts the creation of Eve, and while in Gen 2:15–25 this happens in Eden, in Jub. 3:9 it happens outside Eden. Adam is not admitted to Eden until forty days had passed and Eve remains outside a further forty days (3:8–14), because “it is more holy than any land” (3:12). This delay is attributed to the laws of purification after the birth of a female child (Lev 12:1–5), where a new mother is not permitted to enter the sanctuary (ἱερόν, Jub. 3:10) for that time. Thus, the creation of Eve provides a paradigm for the later law concerning purification after childbirth.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, Jub. 3:6 adds to the Genesis account that when God brought Eve to Adam “he knew her,” a euphemism for sexual intercourse,¹⁶⁵ which, according to the author of Jubilees, could not take place in a sanctuary since it renders a person unclean (Lev 15:18).¹⁶⁶

The next indication that Eden is a sanctuary is found in Jub. 3:27. As Adam leaves the garden he offers a sweet smelling sacrifice and covers his shame. Since incense is burned at the entrance to the holy of holies,¹⁶⁷ Eden is equivalent to the holy of holies, and since Adam covers his shame (nakedness),

162 Levenson 1985: 128–31, 142–45; Wenham 1986: 19–25; Barker 1991: 68–103; Parry 1994: 126–51; Stordalen 2000: 307–12; 457–59; Beale 2004b: 66–80. See also Ezek 28:11–19, and the discussion of this text in McKenzie 1956: 323.

163 Hayward 1996: 90.

164 A similar prohibition is found in 4Q265. See Levison 1988: 92–93; Milgrom 1993: 278; Baumgarten 1994: 5–8; Himmelfarb 1999b: 25–27; Ruiten 1999a: 77; 1999b: 219–20; 2000: 86–87; Segal 2007: 47–49; VanderKam 2008: 412–13. On the other hand, Ravid 2002: 76–80 finds it difficult to understand that God could create two impure persons and argues that Jub. 3:10–11 comprises general regulations relating to impurity after childbirth that have been combined with the Adam and Eve story. See the response to Ravid in VanderKam 2002: 213.

165 HALOT 391, s.v. יָדָע, 6. See Anderson 1989: 128–29; Ruiten 2000: 80–81; Loader 2007: 242–45, 286, 88; Doering 2009: 262–64, and Jub. 3:34. Both Anderson 1989: 125–28 and Loader 2007: 240, 286 suggest that Adam observes sexual activity between the animals in Jub. 3:1–3 and longs for the same. See also Gen. Rab. 17:4, where every animal has a partner but Adam has none.

166 Ravid 2002: 78 points out that there are two distinct categories here: uncleanness in connection with sexual activity and uncleanness in connection with childbirth. For the former see Anderson 1989: 129; Ruiten 1999a: 76–77; 1999b: 218. See also 11QTemple XLV 11–12; CD XI 21–XII 2. In Gen. Rab. 18:6; 19:3 the opposite is true, and Adam and Eve have sexual relations in Eden.

167 Exod 30:7–8, 34–38; Num 16:39–40; 2 Chr 26:16–20.

he plays the part of a priest (Exod 20:26; 28:42).¹⁶⁸ Adam the priest is the first of a priestly line that includes Enoch, who offered the evening incense offering in Eden (4:23–26).¹⁶⁹

Aside from these texts where it can be inferred that Eden is a sanctuary, this fact is explicitly stated in two other texts. In Jub. 4:26 Eden is one of four sacred places on the earth, including the mountain of the East, Sinai and Zion. In 8:19 there are three holy places, Eden, Sinai and Zion, with Eden described as “the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord.”¹⁷⁰

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are presented as death-bed speeches by the sons of Jacob.¹⁷¹ In each case the patriarch gives an account of his life and exploits, including his wicked behaviour. He encourages his descendants to live well and predicts that they will not do so.¹⁷² Joseph is presented as the paradigmatic virtuous person whose example the patriarchs’ descendants are encouraged to follow. They are also encouraged to honour and obey Levi and Judah, because the priesthood and the kingship were given to them respectively and because Israel’s salvation would come from them (e.g. T. Jud. 21:1–4; T. Sim. 7:1–3).¹⁷³ The Testaments also predict the coming of an ideal saviour (e.g. T. Levi 18; T. Jud. 24), descended from Levi and/or Judah, and they predict that the descendants of the patriarchs will reject this saviour, resulting in their exile. Ultimately, they will be restored (e.g. T. Jud. 24; T. Dan 5:10; T. Gad 8:1).¹⁷⁴ The issues of sexual impropriety detected in 1 Enoch carry over

168 Levison 1988: 94; Ruiten 1999a: 77–78; 1999b: 219; 2000: 88, 106; Scott 2005: 31, 56–57, 134–45.

169 For Enoch as a priest see Ruiten 1999b: 220; VanderKam 1984a: 186; Anderson 1989: 129; Larson 2009: 372. In Jub. 4:25 Enoch offers incense on Mount Qatar. The identification of this mountain is problematic. Wintermute 1985: 63 identifies it as “an eastern mountain identified with incense;” Ruiten 1999a: 78, 1999b: 220 suggests that it is at the gate of Eden, as do Charles 1913c: 19; VanderKam 1984a: 186–87; Scott 2005: 56–57.

170 Suter 2009: 405 notes that since the three sanctuaries in 8:19 face each other, they correspond to “the *debir*, the *hekhal*, and the *’ulam* of one temple.”

171 For introductions to the Testaments, see Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 1–85; De Jonge 1987: 359–420; Kugler 2001: 11–39; Nickelsburg 2005: 302–3.

172 Slingerland 1984: 531–32.

173 See De Jonge 1953: 86–89 for a discussion of the L-J (Levi-Judah) passages. A convenient list of these is found in Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 40–41.

174 See the list of the so-called “Sin-Exile-Return” passages in De Jonge 1991: 164–65.

into the Testaments. In some cases, these issues are connected with the temple, evidencing the same dissatisfaction with the temple found in 1 Enoch and Jubilees.¹⁷⁵

The compilation history of the Testaments is complex and has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate.¹⁷⁶ I am persuaded by De Jonge's arguments that while they reached their present form in the second half of the second century CE, they were composed some time earlier. Their present form is the result of extensive Christian redactional activity on pre-existing Jewish documents, although the precise content of these documents can no longer be determined.¹⁷⁷ Whether the Testaments are of Jewish or Christian provenance is not critical for this study.¹⁷⁸ They were probably composed by Christians sometime in the first two centuries of the Common Era, but based, at least in part, on pre-existing Jewish documents.¹⁷⁹

175 Suter 1979a 128–31; Nickelsburg 1981a: 589, Himmelfarb 1993: 21–23; 1999a: 1–6; Wardle 2010: 82–84. For a recent reassessment see Suter 2002: 137–42.

176 For an early account see De Jonge 1953: 38–52, and for convenient summaries of the major positions see Dean-Otting 1984: 76–80; Collins 1998: 133–36; 2000a: 174–77.

177 De Jonge 1991: 233–34. On p. 241 he suggests that “it is extremely difficult to find convincing proof for the existence of such a [pre-existing Jewish] document, nor are we in a position to determine its contents.” See also De Jonge 1960: 187–88. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 2 note that various attempts have been made to distinguish between “sources, contributions by the author and later interpolations and additions” yielding widely differing results, so much so that it seems that the only viable option is to interpret the Testaments in the form in which they have been preserved, without attempting to delineate sources, whether Jewish or Christian (p. 8, see also Charlesworth 1985: 100–101). Wardle 2010: 82 (note 111) notes that the existence of 4QTNaph (4Q215) is evidence of testamentary writing connected with the twelve patriarchs in the second and first centuries BCE.

178 Davila 2005b: 23–63 discusses the complexity involved in assessing whether a particular pseudepigraphon is either Jewish or Christian, or somewhere on a continuum between the two. See also the discussion in De Jonge 1991: 150–51, 160–63.

179 Slingerland 1977: 106–14 concludes that the Testaments should be seen as documents with both Jewish and Christian origins, which “reveal the contours of life in both Jewish and Christian communities.” Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 67 decline to describe them as either “typically” Jewish or “typically” Christian.” Neither do they believe it possible to decide whether there ever was a “Jewish *Testaments*” (ibid.: 85). Elsewhere, De Jonge 1991: 155 states that it is “practically certain” that the present Testaments were composed in Greek, given that they often presuppose the wording of the LXX and use Hellenistic or Hellenistic-Jewish terms. See also the useful summaries in Charlesworth 1981b: 211–13; 1993: 32–34. On the proposal of a Jewish source for the Testaments see Puech 1992: 490, and the critique of this in Knibb 1995: 181–84. One identifiable pre-existing document that must be considered in connection with T. Levi is the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD). Witnesses to ALD were first discovered in a MS the Cairo Geniza, parts of which are held in

The Corrupt Priesthood and Defiled Temple

Several texts in the Testaments predict a new, pure and glorious eschatological temple, with the implication that the second temple that it will replace has been defiled. These references are usually connected with the writings of Enoch,¹⁸⁰ and display the same dissatisfaction with the temple and priesthood

the Cambridge University Library (Cambridge MS T. S. 16 fol. 94), and parts in the Bodleian Library (Bodleian MS Heb c 27, fol. 56). For the relationship of these parts see the diagram in Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004, facing p. 1. See also Milik 1955c: 399–406. A number of fragments were also discovered at Qumran (4QLevi^{a–f}). These are all in Hasmonean script, and are dated on palaeographical grounds between 150–151 BCE (Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 4). Caquot 1998: 5–25 analyses and translates all the major Qumran fragments associated with Levi and, in addition to 4QLevi^{a–f}, he includes 4QapocrLevi^{a–b}, 4QTQahat, the Testament of Amram (4Q543–4Q548) and the Work Mentioning Hur and Miriam ar (4Q549). For an assessment of these other works see Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 25–29. Although De Jonge 1953: 38–52, 129–31 and Milik 1955e: 87; 1955c: 404–6 originally referred to 1Q21 as “Testament de Lévi,” later, De Jonge (De Jonge 1991: 147–48; De Jonge and Tromp 1998: 220) clarified that this is not the case. It seems to be an Aramaic work that the compiler of T. Levi was aware of in some form and used. Another witness to ALD is in part of a Greek translation discovered at Mt Athos in Greece (Athos, Monastery of Koutloumos Cod. 39, hereinafter MS e). Both Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 5 and Drawnel 2004: 31 assign an eleventh century date to MS e. It contains three passages that are not part of T. Levi, two of which contain material also found in the Qumran and Geniza MSS. The Greek and Aramaic witnesses to ALD are conveniently assembled in Charles 1966: 245–56. Stone 1988: 159–61 dates ALD in the third century BCE, based on the palaeographical dating of the Qumran fragments, and its use as a source for Jubilees. Milik 1976: 24 proposes an even earlier date, perhaps in the fourth century BCE, as does Lange 2008: 79, while De Jonge and Tromp 1998: 213–14 suggests the second century. The precise date is outside my scope. The referencing system for ALD is complex. Three major studies have been undertaken, all of which use a different system; Kugler 1996 and Drawnel 2004 use (and supplement) the versification developed by Charles 1908: 245–56, with minor differences. Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004 have developed a system of chapters and verses from 1:1–13:16, which I use in what follows. When referring to the Qumran witnesses I use the fragment, column and line numbers from DJD XXII. For those parts of ALD included in T. Levi see Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 48–50. For discussions of the relationship between ALD and T. Levi see Himmelfarb 1984: 59; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 23–24, 130; De Jonge 1991: 150–54; 244–62; Kugler 1996: 2–7; 2001: 31; Knibb 1998: 203–13; De Jonge and Tromp 1998: 220–24, 232; Drawnel 2004: 1–4. For anti-temple and anti-priesthood polemic in ALD see Wardle 2010: 56–57.

- 180 Enoch is frequently mentioned as an authority who predicts that the descendants of the Patriarchs will fall into sin. See T. Sim. 5:4; T. Levi 10:5; 14:1; 16:1; T. Jud. 18:1; T. Dan 5:6; T. Naph. 4:1; T. Zebu. 3:4. See also 4QLevi^a 3 + 4 6 which reads הלא קבלן ח[נך] (“did not Enoch accuse”).

as is evident in 1 Enoch. Resolution comes with the anticipation of an eschatological temple.

Testament of Levi

While T. Levi does not specifically refer to an eschatological temple, three texts predict the defiling of the second temple. The first is in T. Levi 10:5 and is connected with the wickedness of Levi's descendants and their exile. In 10:2 Levi predicts that they will transgress "against the saviour of the world" (εἰς τὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου) "acting impiously" (ἀσεβέω).¹⁸¹ This will lead to exile "since he (the Lord) will not bear Jerusalem" (ὥστε μὴ βαστάξει τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ) on account of their sin, and will tear apart "the covering of the temple" (σχίσει τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ναοῦ).¹⁸² The reason for God's judgement against Jerusalem and the temple is given in 10:5, "For the house which the Lord will choose, will be called Jerusalem" (ὁ γὰρ οἶκος, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται κύριος, Ἱερουσαλήμ κληθήσεται), as the book of Enoch the righteous contains.¹⁸³ The sense of this causal clause is not immediately clear, but probably indicates the uniqueness of Jerusalem as chosen by God as the temple-city where his name is set.¹⁸⁴ If God's name is defiled by their actions, God's name will be removed. The reference to the writings of Enoch may be to the Animal Apocalypse, although Jerusalem is not specifically named there.¹⁸⁵

Another passage that mentions Enoch extends from T. Levi 14:1–15:4. Here Levi knows from the writing of Enoch that at the end his descendants will "act impiously against the Lord" (ἀσεβήσετε ἐπὶ κύριον). There is significant Christian material in this part of T. Levi and the details concern the treatment of Christ by the priestly hierarchy (vv. 1–4). But this is not all. In v. 5 Levi predicts that they will steal from the offerings, eat with prostitutes and teach out of covetousness. Then, in v. 6 he predicts that they will engage in all sorts of

181 Kee 1983: 792 reads "[against Christ, the savior of the world]" (square brackets original). While Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 160 identify the saviour of the world as Christ, there seems to be no textual justification for Kee to include it in the text.

182 A similar expression appears in T. Benj. 9:4, ἔσται τὸ ἄπλωμα τοῦ ναοῦ σχιζόμενον ("and the covering of the temple will be torn"). The context there is the crucifixion of Christ and reflects Matt 27:51. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 79–81 read T. Levi 10:3 as a further reference to the tearing of the veil of the temple and attribute the use of the term ἔνδυμα ("clothing") to the interpretation, "so as not to cover your shame" (ὥστε μὴ κατακαλύπτειν ἀσχημοσύνην ὑμῶν). See also Kee 1983: 792, note b.

183 Translation from Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 159.

184 Deut 12; 2 Kings 21:7; 23:27; 2 Chr 6:34, 38; 33:7; Tob 1:4.

185 1 En. 89:40, 50, 54, 56, 66, 72.

sexual impropriety, even to the extent of taking wives from the Gentiles.¹⁸⁶ The outcome of this activity is explained in 15:1, “Because of these things the temple which the Lord will choose will be desolate in uncleanness” (διὰ ταῦτα ὁ ναός, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξηται κύριος, ἔρημος ἔσται ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ) and they will be exiled among the Gentiles. There is no promise of restoration. Rather, the text ends with an expression of God’s faithfulness to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, without whom there would be no descendants of Levi left on the earth. Here, the reference to the writings of Enoch is combined with predictions of priestly impropriety with women and the desolation of the temple.¹⁸⁷ The theme of dissatisfaction with the priesthood leading to the desolation of the temple is clear.

The final reference to Enoch in T. Levi is in 16:1–5. Here, Levi learns from the book of Enoch that they will go astray for seventy weeks.¹⁸⁸ There follows a long catalogue of their sins, beginning with desecrating the priesthood and defiling the sacrifices (τὴν ἱερωσύνην βεβηλώσετε καὶ τὰς θυσίας μιανεῖτε). Ultimately, their wickedness will lead them to kill “a man who renews the law in the power of the Most High” (ἄνδρα ἀνακαινοποιούντα νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου), a further reference to Christ (v. 3),¹⁸⁹ because of whom “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) “will be desolate and razed to the ground” (ἔσται ἔρημα . . . ἕως ἐδάφους μεμιαμμένα).¹⁹⁰ This text attributes the fall of Jerusalem to the rejection of Christ by the religious leaders who are the descendants of Levi. The chapter ends with a prediction that they will be scattered among the Gentiles, where they will be a

186 On this text and its antecedents in ALD see Himmelfarb 1999a: 11–12. Milik 1976: 23 suggests some relationship between what is now 4QLevi^a 3 and T. Levi 14:1–3, although there are considerable differences between the two texts. See also De Jonge 1991: 183–85; Kugler 1996: 187–88; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 216; Drawnel 2004: 37; 245–46.

187 There is no clear text in 1 Enoch that the writer refers to (VanderKam 1995a: 145); nevertheless, the underlying theology of Enoch, especially in BW and the Animal Apocalypse, seems to have informed the writer of the Testaments.

188 There is no reference to seventy weeks in 1 Enoch, although seventy generations appears in 1 En. 10:12. The words **בשבעים השבוע** (“in the seventieth week”) appear in 4Q181 2 5 (for this line numbering see Milik 1976: 249, it is line 3 in Allegro 1968: 80). Milik, p. 251 claims that 4Q180 and 4Q181 are copies of the same document (4Q Ages of Creation), although Strugnell 1969–71: 252–55 finds the relationship between the two documents difficult to define. The combined document refers twice to **עזאזל** (“Azaz’el”), thus there is some connection to 1 Enoch.

189 Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 172.

190 The translation “razed to the ground” is from Kee 1983: 794.

curse until the return of the Messiah, who will receive them “through faith and water” (ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι), a reference to Christian baptism.¹⁹¹

Testament of Dan 5:4–13

In T. Dan 5:6 Dan explains to his descendants that he had read in the book of Enoch the righteous one, that their ruler was Satan and that all the spirits of “impurity” (πορνεία) and insolence would obey Levi “to concern themselves with” (παρεδρεύω)¹⁹² the sons of Levi so as to cause them to sin before the Lord. Again, there is no specific text in 1 Enoch that has this as its focus, but the reference to πορνεία reflects the sexual impropriety that occupies much of 1 Enoch.¹⁹³

This wickedness results in exile (vv. 7–8), followed by a return to the Lord, who will bring them “into his sanctuary” (εἰς τὸ ἁγίασμα αὐτοῦ). Verse 12 expands on this, referring to “holy ones resting in Eden” (ἀναπαύσονται ἐν Ἐδέμ ἁγιοί), and “righteous ones rejoicing in the new Jerusalem” (ἐπὶ τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐφρανθήσονται δίκαιοι). Rest in Eden and rejoicing in the new Jerusalem are evidence of the combination of eschatology and protology that reflects Eden as a sanctuary and the new Jerusalem as the return to the conditions of Eden.¹⁹⁴

Verse 13 proclaims safety for Jerusalem and security for Israel, with “the Lord in the midst of her” (Κύριος ἔσται ἐμμέσῳ αὐτῆς), “living together with people and the Holy One of Israel reigning over them” (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστρεφόμενος, καὶ ἅγιος Ἰσραὴλ βασιλεύων ἐπ’ αὐτούς).¹⁹⁵

There are allusions to Exod 15:17–18 in this part of T. Dan, with the Lord bringing his people to his “sanctuary” (ἁγίασμα, Exod 15:17) and reigning over them (Exod 15:18). The sanctuary of the Exodus text is read in T. Dan as the eschatological sanctuary to be built by God, as in Jubilees and in some texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁹⁶

Testament of Benjamin 9:1–5

This sin-exile-return passage predicts evil deeds among the descendants of Benjamin, as foretold in the words of Enoch the righteous. The text explains

191 Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 173. Nowhere does Enoch predict a diaspora among the nations (VanderKam 1995a: 145).

192 This word has cultic connotations in some contexts, see BDAG 773. See 1 Cor 9:13. In Prov 1:21; 8:3 it is used of Wisdom taking a stand in “High Street.”

193 For descendants of Dan causing a Levite to sin see Judg 18:11–30.

194 See Jub. 4:26; 2 En. 8; 3 En. 23:18; 4 Ezra 7:36; 8:52; 2 Bar. 4:3–5; Rev 3:12; 21:2; 22:2. See also Hofius 1970b: 64.

195 Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 289.

196 Jub 1:17, 27–29; 11QTemple XXIX 7–9; 4QmidrEschat^a.

that they will act with the impurity of Sodom and revive sensuality with women. God will immediately remove his kingdom from them. “Nevertheless, the temple of God will be in their portion” (πλὴν ἐν μερίδι ὑμῶν γενήσεται ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ). This expression probably refers to the New Jerusalem and an earthly eschatological temple in the territory of Benjamin.¹⁹⁷ Following this, both Kee, and Hollander and De Jonge read a text that expresses the idea that “the last [temple] will be more glorious than the first.”¹⁹⁸ This refers not to the second temple replacing the first, but to the eschatological temple that God will build at the end of time.¹⁹⁹

Conclusion

This selection of “Enoch” texts in the Testaments mostly evidences a preoccupation with sexual impropriety, together with resultant defilement of the temple. There is considerable Christian material, referring to the way the descendants of each patriarch will mistreat Christ, leading in several cases to the end of the temple, and in two cases to the prediction of an eschatological temple where God will dwell with his people. Given the proposed dating of the Testaments, the question needs to be asked whether these texts are grappling with the loss of the temple. If this is the case, the texts place the blame for the loss of the temple on the mistreatment of Christ by the Jewish leaders, and should therefore be read as polemic against Judaism using the important figure of Enoch to express this polemic. In T. Dan and T. Benj. the texts anticipate a glorious temple in the eschaton, and T. Dan combines eschatology with protology, referring to rest in Eden. The Testament of Benjamin places this eschatological temple in the territory of Benjamin.

The Testament of Levi

While Levi is a significant figure throughout the Testaments as the one from whom a redeemer will come, and the one to be honoured and obeyed as the anointed priest,²⁰⁰ he is even more prominent in T. Levi. Indeed, the Testaments can be read as an apology for a priestly messiah descended from Levi and a

197 Deut 33:12; Josh 18:11–28. Tg. Onq., Tg. Ps-J., and Tg. Neof. Gen 49:27 all refer to the temple being built in the territory of Benjamin.

198 Kee 1983: 827; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 434–35, see De Jonge, Hollander, De Jonge and Korteweg 1978: 175 for the textual variants in this verse.

199 Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 435. See Hag 2:9; Tob 14:5; Jub. 1:17, 27–29; 1 En. 90:29; T. Dan 5:12.

200 T. Reu. 6:5–12; T. Sim. 7:1–3; T. Jud. 21:1–6; T. Iss. 5:6–8; T. Dan 5:4, 7–13; T. Naph. 5:3–6; 8:1–2; T. Gad 8:1; T. Jos. 19:11–12.

royal messiah from Judah, with the Testaments other than T. Levi and T. Jud. preparing the reader for what they will encounter in these two works.²⁰¹

The Testament of Levi resolves the dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple with reference to a pure heavenly temple.²⁰² It contains details of Levi's journey to this heavenly temple, and of his consecration as a priest.²⁰³ In T. Levi 2–3 an angel conducts Levi on this journey and reveals to him that he will stand near the Lord as his “minister” (λειτουργός, 2:10). In 3:1–8 this angel describes the heavens, and Levi sees “the great glory in the holy of holies, above all holiness” (ἡ μεγάλη δόξα ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος, 3:4);²⁰⁴ in 4:2 he is told that he will be “a son, a servant and a minister” (υἱὸν καὶ θεράποντα καὶ λειτουργόν) in the presence of the Most High; and in 5:1–2 Levi sees “the holy sanctuary, and the Most High on a glorious throne” (τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τὸν ὑψιστον) through the opened gates of heaven, and God announces that he has been given the blessing of the priesthood. In 8:3 seven men clothe him in priestly garb and command him “to be a priest” (γίνου εἰς ἱερέα) along with his descendants; in 9:3 he recounts a vision in which Jacob learned that Levi would be a priest;²⁰⁵ and in 12:5 Levi himself says that he became a “priest” (ἱεράτευσα) at nineteen years of age. Temple symbolism appears finally in 18:6, where “the glorious sanctuary” (ὁ ναὸς τῆς δόξης) is the place from which holiness will come from the voice of a father upon the new priest who will arise.

T. Levi seems to be dependent to some degree upon BW.²⁰⁶ In T. Levi 14–16, Levi explains that he had learned from the “writing of Enoch” (ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνώχ, 14:1) that his descendants would “act impiously against the Lord” (ἀσεβήσετε ἐπὶ κύριον, 14:1). In 14:5–8 their evil deeds are catalogued, including defilement through sexual contact with improper women (14:6), and in 15:1–16:5 Levi predicts the exile and the desolation of the temple. The ultimate outcome is the return from exile and the “new priest” that the Lord will raise up (18:2).

201 De Jonge 1953: 112; Slingerland 1984: 532–37 argue from the “we” passage in T. Levi 19:2–3 that the Testaments are “a product of Israel’s Levitical circles.”

202 Wardle 2010: 84; Barnard 2012: 59.

203 I only deal with those texts that contain explicit temple symbolism and make no comment on texts referring to the priesthood of Levi without such symbolism.

204 Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own. Quotations from the Greek text are from De Jonge, Hollander, De Jonge and Korteweg 1978.

205 T. Levi 9 also includes Jacob’s detailed instructions to Levi on how to function as a priest.

206 Milik 1955c: 404–5. For a list of similarities between the two documents see Nickelsburg 1981a: 588–89.

Levi's Heavenly Journey (T. Levi 2:5–3:10)

In T. Levi 2:5–3:10 Levi undertakes a journey to the second heaven, from where he sees the third heaven and where his angelic guide reveals details of another four heavens. He explains in 2:2–5 how he was praying about the corruption of humanity when he fell asleep. In a dream, he sees a high mountaintop and “the heavens opened” (ἡνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί).²⁰⁷ An angel invites him to enter, and he enters the lower heavens and sees the higher heavens.²⁰⁸ A brief description of what Levi sees follows in 2:7–8, and in 3:1–8 the angel describes the heavens with more detail. In the uppermost heaven, God dwells.

207 ALD 4:4–5 (4QLevi^b 1116) reads בחזית חזויה וחזית שמניא (“in the vision of visions I saw heaven . . .”). Milik 1955c: 399, 404 (followed by *DSSSE* 450–51) relates this line to the heavens being opened in T. Levi 2:5 and the prayer of Levi preserved in MS e, interpolated here, with the answer to the prayer found in T. Levi 4:2. Milik’s reconstruction was adopted by Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 142 and Wright 2000b: 144–45, but rejected by De Jonge 1974: 137–39; Greenfield and Stone 1990: 154–58; Stone and Greenfield 1993: 249–53; Stone 2003: 430–37; Kugler 1996: 82–87; Knibb 1998: 205–7; Drawnel 2004: 224–28; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 138–39. Nothing in the context of ALD at this point demands that this line belongs here. Kugler 1996: 83 notes that there is not enough preserved “to decide with complete confidence which of the many possibilities for its reconstruction and placement is correct.” Kugler himself (p. 175) relates it to the beginning of T. Levi 8. For detailed arguments for this placement see Stone 2003: 430–37.

208 The text-critical issues surrounding T. Levi 2–3 are complex. One group of MSS (α) refers to three heavens, while another group (non- α) refers to four additional heavens in 2:9, which they describe in 3:3–8. The α MSS compress these descriptions into the third heaven. In the α MSS of 2:5–10 Levi enters the first heaven and sees the remainder (Kee 1983: 788). In the non- α MSS Levi enters the second heaven and sees the third (De Jonge, Hollander, De Jonge and Korteweg 1978: 26). In the α MSS the angel tells him he will see the third heaven and ascend to it and receive the priesthood, while in the non- α MSS he sees the third heaven and the angel advises him that he will see four more heavens. In the α MSS the heavens are described in the order 1-2-3-2, and in the non- α MSS the seven heavens are described in the order 1-2-3-7-6-5-4. For a discussion of the text-critical issues of this part of T. Levi and arguments for the secondary nature of the α manuscripts see De Jonge 1974: 133–36; 1975: 61–68; 1991: 148–51. Kee 1983: 788–89 considers that the inclusion of the seven heavens is a modification and expansion of an original reference to three heavens, as do Charles 1913f: 304–6; Collins 1995a: 63–65; Collins 1995c: 46, 56 (note 12); Carlsson 2004: 100–102, and Alexander 2006: 80, while Wright 2000b: 144, 148 and Barnard 2012: 61 consider the three-heaven schema to be a corruption of the earlier seven-heaven schema, perhaps by a Christian editor under the influence of 2 Cor 12:1–4. Kugler 1996: 181 comments that “all that can be said is that one scheme was original, and the other was imposed later” (note 36). Dean-Otting 1984: 80, 87 proposes eight heavens, suggesting that there are seven, plus a “heaven above the heavens” where God dwells (3:4).

The first announcement of Levi's elevation to the priesthood appears in 2:9–11, although the word “priest” does not appear.²⁰⁹ The angel advises Levi that he will see the higher, more brilliant and incomparable heavens, and when he ascends there he will stand near the Lord (σὺ ἐγγὺς κυρίου στήση), and will become his “cultic official” (λειτουργός).²¹⁰ The service of Levi is then detailed, involving the announcement of the Lord's mysteries among people,²¹¹ and proclamation concerning the coming redeemer of Israel. In its present context in T. Levi this statement implies that in the milieu in which T. Levi circulated one function of the OT priesthood and cultus was to point to Christ, something reflected in Heb 8–10.²¹²

It is unclear whether Levi is envisaged as a heavenly or an earthly priest. On the one hand, when he ascends to the upper heaven he will stand near the Lord. On the other hand, he is to declare God's mysteries to the people. Hollander and De Jonge suggest that “Levi's priestly service on earth is carried out in the presence of God.”²¹³ This is somewhat analogous to the role of the

-
- 209 The text is based in part upon Mal 2:4–7. Kugel 1993: 30–36 traces the influence of Mal 2:4–7 in this part of T. Levi, which he refers to as “Levi's Apocalypse.” He suggests that this “apocalypse” may have originally existed independently (pp. 37–38). In Mal 2:4–7, true instruction comes from Levi and he is the messenger (ἄγγελος) of the Lord of hosts. See also Deut 33:8–10.
- 210 See Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135 for the cultic connotations of this word. See Exod 28:35, 43; Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; Let. Aris. 95; Heb 8:2; 1 Clem 41:2, and in connection with Levi, Num 8:22; 16:9; 18:6; Deut 10:8; 18:5, 7; 1 Chr 15:2; 2 Chr 29:11; Ezek 40:46; T. Levi 4:2; Jub. 30:18; 31:14; 11QTemple LX 10–11; 1QSB IV 24–25.
- 211 The word μυστήριον has apocalyptic connotations. Bornkamm 1967: 815–16 refers to the use of this word in connection with heavenly journeys in which things normally concealed from humans are revealed. See Brown 1968: 1–30; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135; Bockmuehl 1990: 31–32; Rowland 1982: 9–14; Carlsson 2004: 107; Dean-Otting 1984: 86–87, 89–90. Stone 1976: 414–19 notes that matters revealed in apocalyptic include details about the nature of the heavenly sanctuary and occur “at the high point of a revelation” (p. 418). Gruenwald 1980: 29–72 discusses the mystical aspects of apocalyptic literature, and the relationship between this literature and merkabah mysticism.
- 212 The proclamation of “the coming redeemer of Israel” (τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ, 2:10) is no doubt a reference to Christ and betrays Christian origins (Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135, see also T. Sim. 7:1–2; T. Levi 18:1–14). An allusion to Luke 24:21 (ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ) seems likely.
- 213 Ibid.: 134. In T. Jud. 21:1–5 the priesthood is said to be superior to the kingship because, while God had given the things on earth to Judah, to Levi he had given “the things in heaven” (τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς). Accordingly, just as heaven “is higher” (ὑπερέχει) than earth, so the priesthood is higher than the (earthly) kingship. The pericope concludes that Levi had been chosen to “draw near” (ἐγγίζω) to God. Similar notions are expressed in

angel Raphael in Tobit. In Tob 12:11–15 Raphael is said to stand in the presence of God. He takes Tobias's prayer into the presence of God, but also appears to Tobias and Sarah on earth. Levi, like Raphael, receives a revelation of divine mysteries in the heavenly sanctuary and brings them to bear on earthly things. The angel Gabriel has a similar function in Luke 1–2, revealing heavenly things to Zechariah and Mary.²¹⁴ Since the temple is a microcosm of the universe and "heaven on earth," to "stand near the Lord" refers to Levi's priestly service in the earthly temple/tabernacle, also understood as service in the presence of God. Thus, in this text, there is no rigid distinction between the earthly and the heavenly temple. But, unlike those texts where the earthly temple is heaven on earth, and to be in the temple is to be in the presence of God in heaven, here, the true temple is in heaven, and its boundaries are extended to encompass the people of God on earth.

In T. Levi 3 the angelic guide explains the contents of the various heavens to Levi. In 3:3c the upper heavens "down to the fourth" are said to be "holy" (ἅγιοι), although Wright considers that it is the angels inhabiting them who are described as ἅγιοι, being elevated above unrighteousness.²¹⁵ It is difficult to decide between these two options, but the causal clause beginning v. 4 (ὅτι)

Jub. 30:18 (where Levi is said to have been chosen to serve in the presence of the Lord); and in 31:14 (where Jacob blesses Levi and prays that the Lord would draw him and his seed near to him to serve in his sanctuary as the angels of the presence and the holy ones). See also Exod 19:21–22; 24:2; Lev 10:3; 21:21; Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 1QSb IV 24–28.

214 It is somewhat similar in the case of Zechariah. The angel Gabriel appears to him in the "temple" (ναός, Luke 1:9) and is described as "an angel of the Lord" (ἄγγελος κυρίου, 1:11). When Zechariah questions Gabriel, he replies "I am Gabriel, the one who stands before God, and I have been sent to speak to you" (ἐγώ εἰμι Γαβριήλ ὁ παρῑστηκώς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σέ, 1:19). The temple does not feature in Gabriel's appearance to Mary, and there is no such explanation (1:26–37).

215 The Greek text reads οἱ δὲ εἰς τὸν τέταρτον ἐπάνω τούτων ἅγιοι εἰσιν. Wright 2000b: 147 translates, "But those in the fourth (heaven) above these are the holy ones," as does Dean-Otting 1984: 90–91. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136 translate "But the heavens down to the fourth above these are holy," referring to Ps 20:6 (LXX 19:7); Wis 9:10 and 1 En. 15:3, which describe heaven as ἅγιος (p. 138). Wright argues that the inhabitants of heaven are holy, rather than the heavens themselves, and that the οἱ δὲ in 3:3 sets up a contrast between these and the powers in the third heaven. Wright's reading recognises that οἱ δὲ usually indicates a change to a new subject (Moulton and Turner 1963: 37)—the angels in contrast to the powers in the third heaven (v 3a)—and that εἰς is sometimes equivalent to ἐν (ibid.: 254–55, BDAG 289, s.v. εἰς 1. a. δ and 1.b. β). For angels designated as οἱ ἅγιοι see Job 5:1; 15:15; Dan 7:21; Tob 11:14; 1 En. 1:9; 14:22–23, 25; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; Rev 14:10; Jude 14.

seems to indicate that it is the heavens that are holy, because of those who dwell there. If this is correct, the heavens constitute the sacred space of a temple. This sacred space exhibits decreasing levels of holiness from the top to the bottom. Just as in the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple, there are decreasing degrees of holiness the further away one travels from the holy of holies.²¹⁶

In the seven temple schema in T. Levi, the following verses describe these decreasing levels of holiness. “In the uppermost heaven” (ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ πάντων) “the great glory” (ἡ μεγάλη δόξα)²¹⁷ “rests” (καταλύει). While this word normally refers to a temporary stay,²¹⁸ it echoes the expression κατάλυμα ἅγιος (“holy dwelling”) used to describe the ultimate goal of the Exodus in Exod 15:13. This is the heavenly temple, further specified as being ἐν ἀγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος (“in the holy of holies, above all holiness”),²¹⁹ that is “the innermost part of the heavenly temple.”²²⁰

Verse 5 describes the inhabitants of the sixth heaven²²¹ as οἱ ἄγγελοι . . . τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου (“angels of the presence of the Lord”).²²² These angels are first described in v. 5 with two participles describing them as “ministers” (λειτουργοῦντες) who “make atonement to the Lord for the sins of ignorance of

²¹⁶ For a similar schema see Asc. Isa. 7–10.

²¹⁷ For other uses of this epithet for God see 1 En. 14:19; 25:3, 7; 47:3; 102:3.

²¹⁸ For this sense of καταλύω see BDAG 522, s.v. καταλύω 4. This word appears in this sense several times in the LXX, but never with God as the subject. The word derives from κατάλυμα (BDAG 521), which has the sense of a lodging place or guest room, that is, a place where one finds rest and hospitality (Louw and Nida 1988: 1: 454). The notion of a temporary dwelling is clear in Luke 9:12; 19:7. In the LXX see Gen 19:2; 24:23, 25; Sir 14:25, 27; 36:27.

²¹⁹ For the expression ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων see Exod 26:33–34; 1 Kings 6:16. The expression τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγια appears in 3 Bar. Prologue 2, and in 2 Bar. 34:1 it appears as a metonym for the (destroyed) earthly temple. In Sib. Or. 3.308 God comes to punish Babylon “from heaven, his holy realm” (ἀπ’ οὐρανὸθεν . . . ἐξ ἁγίων, translation Buitenwerf 2003: 216). The expression ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων appears in Heb 9:3 and as a variant reading (MS P) in Heb 9:12.

²²⁰ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 138; Himmelfarb 1993: 31, 33.

²²¹ It is not referred to specifically as the sixth heaven, but the one “after” the highest (μετά with accusative, see BDAG 637, s.v., μετά B), as the angel describes the heavens in descending order.

²²² For this expression see 1QSb IV 25–26, where the high priest prays that he will become as an angel of the presence, with the angels of the presence; 1QH^a XIV 13, where these angels have direct access to God; and Jub. 30:18; 31:14, where Levi is exalted to serve in the sanctuary as the angels of the presence.

the righteous” (ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων).²²³ The verb ἐξιλάσκειται does not appear in the NT, but is frequent in the LXX with a technical sense of “make atonement for” or “propitiate.”²²⁴ λειτουργέω is used in secular contexts for a variety of public services, but in the LXX this too is a technical term for the service of priests and Levites in the temple.²²⁵ In 2:10 Levi is described as the Lord’s λειτουργός indicating some connection between what these angels do before God, what Levi will do when exalted to the priesthood and what the earthly priests do.²²⁶

In the following verse the function of the angels of the presence is described with a verb in the present indicative. They “offer to the Lord a pleasing, spiritual fragrance, and a bloodless offering” (προσφέρουσι δὲ κυρίῳ ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν).²²⁷ The words λογικός and ἀναίμακτος make it clear that these are not animal offerings.²²⁸ While the

223 The entire expression οἱ λειτουργοῦντες καὶ ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων is governed by a single definite article, indicating not two bodies of angels of the presence, but one with these functions (BDF 144–45, § 276). For ἄγνοια referring to “sin of ignorance” see Gen 26:10; Lev 5:18; 22:14; Ps 25:7 (LXX 24:7); Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; 46:20. In the Ezekiel texts the term is used for “guilt-offering” (NRSV). It is not used in this precise sense in the NT, but see Acts 3:17; 17:30; Eph 4:18; 1 Pet 1:14. See also Pss. Sol. 3:8 for ἐξιλάσκειται used with ἄγνοια, although in that context atonement is made outside the cult, ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ταπεινώσει ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ (“by fasting and humbling his soul”).

224 BDAG 350; Muraoka 2002: 197–98, s.v. ἐξιλάσκειται, 1–6; Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie 2003: 215. See e.g. Exod 30:10, 15, 16; Lev 1:4 and several times in Lev 16 in connection with the Day of Atonement ceremony.

225 BDAG 591, s.v. λειτουργέω 1, a. See Exod 28:35, 43; 29:30; 30:20; 35:19; 36:33; 38:27; 39:11, 12; Num 1:50; 3:6, 31; 4:3, 9, 12, 14, 23, 24, 26, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43; 8:22, 26; 16:9; 18:2, 6, 7, 21, 23; Deut 10:8; 17:12; 18:5, 7; 1 Kgdms 2:11, 18; 3:1; 3 Kgdms 8:11; 4 Kgdms 25:14; 1 Chr 6:17 (LXX); 15:2; 16:4, 37; 23:13, 28, 32; 26:12; 2 Chr 5:14; 8:4; 11:14; 13:10; 23:6; 29:11; 31:2; 35:3; Joel 1:9, 13; 2:17; Jer 52:18; Ezek 40:46; 42:14; 43:19; 44:11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 27; 45:4, 5; 46:14; Jdt 4:14; 1 Macc 10:42; Sir 4:14; 24:10; 45:15.

226 Brooke 1993: 84.

227 This translation is from Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136. For the sense of “spiritual” for λογικός see BDAG 598, who note that with this sense the term contrasts with “literal.” See also Rom 12:1. For ἀναίμακτος (“bloodless”) see LSJ 105.

228 De Jonge 1953: 49 notes that this notion expresses Christian sentiments, and that ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν is a “Christian *terminus technicus*,” referring in the first place to prayer and later to the Eucharist. He lists several patristic sources that corroborate this judgement. See also Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 138. The idea of bloodless sacrifice appears in Athenagoras, *Leg.* 13; Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 1, 6, 29, 50; Origen, *Cels.* 8:21; Apos. Con. 2.25.7; 6.23.5; 8.5.7; Cyril of Alexandria on Heb 5:5; and Ambrose, *Sacre.* 4.6, 27. In some cases, the reference is to prayer and in others to the Eucharist (see PGL 104, 659–60).

language of atonement is used, it appears not to be achieved by animal sacrifice.²²⁹

Verse 7 describes the fifth heaven, where there are angels who bear “answers” to the angels of the presence (in the sixth heaven).²³⁰ The fourth heaven contains another class of angels,²³¹ described as “thrones, and powers” (θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι),²³² among whom hymns of praise are offered to God.²³³

This part of T. Levi evidences a hierarchy of angels serving God in various capacities in the various heavens. The text has a developed concept of heaven that is made up of several layers, with increasing levels of holiness and priestly angels with functions that also reflect their relative proximity to God. To the extent that there are increasing levels of holiness heaven somehow corresponds to the earthly temple, but it surpasses a simple bicameral sanctuary. It is a replacement for the defiled Jerusalem temple and priesthood.

T. Levi 5:1–3

These verses recount the climax of Levi’s heavenly journey.²³⁴ Immediately prior to his return to earth to execute vengeance upon Shechem, Levi tells how the angel opened the gates of heaven and he saw “the holy temple” (τὸν ναὸν

for numerous other patristic sources, and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 272–73). It is difficult to understand this particular text as a reference to the Eucharist being celebrated in heaven. It is clear that animal sacrifice is not in view and it is more likely that the offerings are prayers. Calaway 2013: 173 concludes that the offerings are perhaps “the prayers or the good deeds of the righteous.”

229 Gäbel 2006: 48 notes that this is the only reference to a heavenly sacrificial cult in early Jewish literature prior to 70 CE, suggesting that it might be a Christian interpolation. See also the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (11Q17 IX 4–5) and the function of the future priest in 4QapocrLevi^b 9 I 2 (although this is unlikely to take place in heaven).

230 See 3 Bar. 12:1–8 for angels bringing “the virtues of the righteous” (αἱ ἀρεταὶ τῶν δικαίων) to Michael, the highest archangel dwelling in the fifth heaven.

231 For classes of angels see 1 En. 61:10; 2 En. 20:1; Asc. Isa. 7:21, 27 (see Knibb 1985: 166, note m in Asc. Isa. 7:14) T. Sol. 20:15; T. Adam 4:4, 8; Eph 1:21; Col 1:16.

232 For this sense of θρόνος see BDAG 460, s.v., θρόνος, 2 (“a supreme power over a political entity”). For this usage see 1 Clem. 65:2; Mart. Pol. 21. While the term does not appear, the ideas are also present in Dan 10:13, 20.

233 For praises offered to God see Ps 50 (LXX 49):14, 23; 107 (LXX 106): 22; Hos 14:3; Philo, *Plant*, 126; Let Aris 234; Heb 13:15; Justin *Dial.* 117, and for this offering by angels see Isa 6:3; 1 En. 40:3–4; 61:10–13; 2 En. 17; 19:6; 21:1; 3 Bar. 10:7; Asc. Isa. 7:15–17; Cyril of Alexandria on Heb 5:5, b. Hag. 12b.

234 Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 144. Dean-Otting 1984: 83 notes the similar themes in 2:1–5 and 5:1–7, indicating the “original unity of these two parts.” For a vision of God as the climax of a heavenly journey see 1 En. 14:18–23; 2 En. 22.

τὸν ἄγιον) and “the Most High upon a glorious throne” (καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τὸν ὑψιστον).²³⁵ God addresses Levi and gives him the blessings of the priesthood (σοὶ δέδωκα τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερατείας).²³⁶

There are several differences between this text and T. Levi 3:3–4, where God is said to dwell in the uppermost heaven. Here, there appears to be only one “heaven” (οὐρανός, singular),²³⁷ and the description of God is different. In 3:4 God is described as ἡ μεγάλη δόξα (“the great glory”), “dwelling” (καταλύω) “in the holy of holies, above all holiness” (ἐν ἀγίῳ ἀγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀγιότητος). Here, God is “the Most High” (ὁ ὑψιστος), enthroned on “a throne of glory” (θρόνος δόξης). While it is clear from other texts that the heavenly sanctuary is a throne room where God is enthroned,²³⁸ the cultic symbolism has disappeared from the description and the notion of God’s sovereignty has come into

235 There is some debate as to whether Levi enters heaven, as in T. Levi 2:6, or simply looks through the opened gates. In 2:6 the heavens are opened, he is invited to enter, but he goes no further than the second heaven (2:7) from where he views the remaining heavens. Here, the angel opens the gates of heaven and Levi sees God enthroned in heaven. De Jonge 1974: 138–39, writes “the angel obviously gives Levi access to the highest heaven where the Most High dwells, previously described as the highest heaven (III,4).” Kugel 1993: 27 refers to Levi’s entrance into heaven in the vision of T. Levi 2–3, 5 and notes that he does not enter heaven in the vision of T. Levi 8 (which seems unconnected with heaven). On the other hand Nickelsburg 1981a: 588 states, “The angel opens the gates of heaven (T. Levi 5:1; cf. 4QEn^c 1 6:4 [4Q204]), and he sees—but does not enter—the temple in which God is enthroned (cf. 1 En. 14:15–25).” For the gate of heaven see T. Levi 2:6; 4QLev^b 2 18; Gen 28:17; 3 Macc 6:18; 1 En. 9:2, 10; Rev 4:1. In 3 Bar. 2:2, 5; 3:1; 6:13; 11:2, 5; 15:1; 1 En. 14:12, 15, 25 there are doors to different parts of heaven.

236 Kugel 1993: 27–28 suggests that the visions of heaven are primary in this part of T. Levi, and that Levi’s own role is somewhat secondary, since the priesthood is only mentioned in 5:2, in what he refers to as a “Christian remark”—Levi has the priesthood until God comes to dwell in the midst of Israel—which he reads with reference to Christ, as do Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 143–44 (see below). For a related, but different, tradition concerning Levi receiving the priesthood in a dream see Jub. 32:1 and T. Levi 8–9 (where Levi has a second dream, and Jacob also has a dream concerning Levi’s elevation to the priesthood). For the complexity surrounding these traditions see Kugel 1993: 8–10.

237 This is the eighth heaven in Dean-Otting’s reconstruction (Dean-Otting 1984: 80, 87). De Jonge 1974: 138–39 suggests that the singular οὐρανός may correspond to the expression שְׁמַיָּא תַּרְעִי in 4QLev^b (4Q213a) 1 II 18 (ALD 4:6). Drawnel 2004: 104 translates “gates of heavens,” although the substantive שְׁמַיָּא is an emphatic plural corresponding to Hebrew שְׁמַיִם (Jastrow 1989: 1595b). Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 67 translate “gates of heaven,” and note this as a point of contact between ALD and T. Levi (5:1).

238 For “throne of glory” see Jer 14:21; 17:12; Wis 9:10; 1 En. 9:4. For the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary see Rev 16:17; Heb 8:2. For the notion of God’s throne see 1 Kings 22:19; Isa 6:1; Ezek 1:26; Ps 47:9 (LXX 46:8, EVV 47:8); 1 En. 14:18–23; 2 En. 22:2; T. Mos. 4:2.

the foreground. There is no correspondence here with the earthly sanctuary; rather, this vision presupposes OT call narratives, as is appropriate given Levi's appointment to the priesthood in the immediate context.²³⁹

It seems that T. Levi 2–5 is a composite account of Levi's heavenly journey, some of which has its origins in Aramaic Levi. In one strand of the tradition Levi is taken on a tour through the heavens. The upper heavens are described in cultic terms, and the angel tells him that he will receive the blessing of the priesthood (4:2–3). In the other strand, he sees, and perhaps enters, the heavenly throne room where the Most High is enthroned and he is given the priesthood (5:2). In both cases the priesthood is a temporary endowment, awaiting the coming of Christ. Hebrews 7:11–28 also argues that the Levitical priesthood is a temporary measure, although written as it is from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ (1:1–4), the end of the Levitical priesthood is not anticipated, but seen as already having taken place with the advent of Christ as a priest who is superior in every way.²⁴⁰

The Testament of Moses

The Testament of Moses (T. Mos.), also known as the Assumption of Moses,²⁴¹ is extant in a single, damaged, partly illegible, Latin palimpsest discovered in Milan in 1861, probably dated from the fifth or sixth century.²⁴² It is clearly a

239 Gäbel 2006: 48. On call narratives see the discussion of 1 En. 14:8–23, above. Carlsson 2004: 111–13 details several similarities between T. Levi 3–4 and Isa 6 (although Isaiah is a prophet rather than a priest).

240 Given the late dating of the Testaments in their present form, this part of T. Levi is probably a literary fiction containing *vaticinia ex eventu* concerning the coming of Jesus.

241 The title of the work is a complex issue. There appear to have been at least two Moses apocrypha which were bound together: the Testament of Moses and the Assumption of Moses (Davila 2005b: 149–52). On the basis of a sixth century fragment that quotes T. Mos. 1:14 referring to it as the Assumption of Moses (ἀναλήψεως μωσεώς, for the text see Bauckham 1990b: 260), Tromp 1993: 115–16 continues to refer to the extant work by that name (noting that the title “Testament of Moses” was sometimes associated with Jubilees), as do Rhoads 1973; Sweet 1984: 601–2; Muddiman 2007: 169 and many others, although Tromp 1993: 115 does concur that it “displays the characteristics of a testament.” Given the nature of the work, a number of scholars now refer to it as the Testament of Moses. See Kolenkow 1973: 71–72; Nickelsburg 1973b: 11–12; 2005: 363 (note 33); Collins 1984b: 344–46; Bauckham 1990b: 236; Grierson 2008: 266–74.

242 Charles 1913a: 409; Zeitlin 1947: 1; Nickelsburg 1973b: 5; Priest 1983: 919; Collins 1984b: 344; Tromp 1993: 87–88; Hofmann 2000: 12.

translation of a Greek original, since several Greek words appear transliterated into Latin characters;²⁴³ although some scholars consider that the Greek was translated from a Semitic original, either Hebrew or Aramaic.²⁴⁴ Since the only city mentioned is Jerusalem and since there is no reference to the diaspora, the place of writing is probably Palestine.²⁴⁵ The MS is incomplete and the extent of what is missing is unknown.²⁴⁶

Licht suggests that it was composed in Maccabean times and updated sometime between 4 BCE (the death of Herod the Great) and 30 CE with the insertion of chapters 6–7.²⁴⁷ This suggestion was developed by Nickelsburg, who continues to maintain it,²⁴⁸ although Tromp has mounted a strong case for literary integrity and a date around the turn of the era (4 BCE–30 CE).²⁴⁹ While no consensus has emerged on the question of literary integrity, Tromp's dating

243 Hofmann 2000: 12; Grierson 2008: 274–75.

244 Charles 1913a: 410; Priest 1983: 920. Collins 1984b: 345; Nickelsburg 2005: 77. Tromp 1993: 78–86 concludes that the evidence for a Semitic original is “extremely weak and unconvincing.” Grierson 2008: 275 dismisses the suggestion of a Semitic original as unnecessary, suggesting that the author used “biblicizing Greek when writing about a biblical character.” See also Hofmann 2000: 13–15.

245 Tromp 1993: 117; Hofmann 2000: 12–13.

246 Sweet 1984: 601; Grierson 2008: 266. Priest 1983: 919 opines that around one third to one half has been lost.

247 Licht 1961: 100–103. T. Mos. 6:2–6 mentions “an impudent king” (*rex petulans*) who will reign for thirty-four years, and v. 6 explains that his sons will reign for “shorter periods” (*breviora tempora*). This detail would have been written sometime within thirty-four years of Herod's death in 4 BCE. For the historical details surrounding Herod and his successors see Josephus *Ant.* 17.188–199. Licht (pp. 100–102) also shows that the theory propounded by Charles 1913a: 420 that chapters 8–9 had been transposed from between chapters 5–6 to be untenable, giving the book “neither meaning nor message.” Charles places chapters 6–7 referring to Roman times, after chapter 9 which appears to refer to the persecution under Antiochus IV, thus repairing what he considered to be faulty chronology. Lattey 1942: 11–12 agrees in part with Charles, but argues that only chapter 8 has been displaced, since chapter 10 flows naturally after chapter 9. Collins 1976: 179–86 detects redactional activity in 10:8 with the reference to an eagle reflecting the action of certain young men pulling down the image of an eagle from over the gate of the temple (see Josephus *Ant.* 17.149–167).

248 Nickelsburg 1972 (now 2006: 7, 61–64); 1973a: 33–37; 2005: 74–77, 247–47; Carlson 1982: 85; Priest 1983: 920–21, 930. Collins 1973a: 18–30, who originally argued for literary integrity and composition in 4 BCE, later adopted Licht's theory (1973b: 38–43; 1984b: 347–48; 1998: 129).

249 Tromp 1993: 116–17. For a thorough review of the arguments and counter-arguments see Hofmann 2000: 21–26. Goldstein 1973: 44–47 also argues for literary integrity, but dates the entire work in the time of Antiochus IV.

has been adopted by more recent scholars,²⁵⁰ although still strongly contested by Nickelsburg.²⁵¹ This date precludes Christian provenance.²⁵²

The text takes the form of a testament, a death-bed retelling of Israel's history from the perspective of Deut 31–34.²⁵³ Moses the seer gives Joshua an *ex eventu* prophecy of the history of God's people up to post-exilic times, including the crisis of the Maccabean era. Finally (in the extant form of the work), that crisis is brought to bear on the present situation of the people of Israel under Roman domination.²⁵⁴ This heralds the beginning of the eschaton (10:1).²⁵⁵ Chapter 10 relates the vindication of God's people in cosmic terms, and chapters 11–12 revert to the end of the life of Moses, with Joshua responding to the revelation in appropriate terms and Moses giving him a final charge to remain faithful to the Torah.

Both Solomon's temple and the wilderness tabernacle are highly regarded. The tabernacle appears three times: in 1:7, Joshua is appointed to be Moses' successor for the people and for "the tent of witness with all its holy objects" (*scene testimonii cum omnibus sanctis illis*);²⁵⁶ in an apparent allusion to

250 Hofmann 2000: 28–30; Grierson 2008: 275–77. Charles 1913a: 411 argues for a date between 7–30 CE, and Lattey 1942: 13 refines this to a time close to 30 CE. Zeitlin 1947: 9–12; 27–37 argues for a date around the Bar Kochba revolt (132–135 CE), but this has not found any acceptance. Indeed, the prediction of T. Mos. 3:9 that Israel will never fail from the land that God promised them could hardly have been written after 70 CE (assuming a date after 586 BCE), and Collins 1973a: 15 argues that if the fall of the temple had happened when this "review of history" was written, it would almost certainly have been mentioned. Moreover, 1:17–18 and 8:5 suggest that the temple was still standing. Of course, the date depends on whether literary integrity is accepted. If so, a date in the first third of the first century CE is adopted for the entire work, while if not, this date is for the final form of the work, after the addition of material referring to Herod and his sons.

251 Nickelsburg 2005: 74, 363 (note 34).

252 Davila 2005b: 149–54. Sweet 1984: 604 finds no trace of any Christian influence.

253 Harrington 1973: 59–66.

254 Nickelsburg 2005: 247–48. Assuming the integrity of the work, the reference to Herod and his descendants 6:1–9, followed by the end times, precedes what looks like the Maccabean crisis. The author has read that crisis as a paradigm of God's judgement on his people for their sins, and "foretells" that it will happen again under the rule of Rome (see Schreiber 2001: 259–60).

255 Schreiber 2001: 258. This appears to be the time of the author, since it marks the end of the retelling of history.

256 Latin quotations are from Tromp 1993: 6–25. Unless otherwise noted English translations are mine. The Latin term *scene*, translated "tabernacle," is unattested in any other Latin text. It is a transliteration of the Greek σκηνή and evidence of a Greek *Vorlage*, see *ibid.*: 79. The Vulgate routinely uses *tabernaculum*.

Deut 31:14–23 in 1:9, Joshua's commission takes place "in the tabernacle" (*in scenae*); and in 2:3–4 where, after being ruled by kings and princes for eighteen years, ten tribes will break loose.²⁵⁷ The remaining tribes (*tribus sanctitatus*, "holy tribes," 2:4) will transfer "the tabernacle of the testimony" (*scenae testimonium*),²⁵⁸ and "the God of heaven" (*Deus caelistis*) "will fasten the pole of his tabernacle" (*figet palum scenae*) and "the tower of his sanctuary" (*turrim sanctuarii sui*).²⁵⁹

"Fasten the pole of his tabernacle and the tower of his sanctuary" refers to the building of the temple, which, according to this text, was done not by Solomon but by God who builds *his* tabernacle and *his* sanctuary. This perspective gives divine approval for Solomon's temple. Since the temple and tabernacle seem to be combined in 2:8–9, where the ten tribes erect idols in the tabernacle and act wickedly in the house of the Lord, the tabernacle also has divine approval.²⁶⁰ However, consequent on the apostasy of both the ten tribes

257 The chronology is obscure. Charles 1913a: 416 and Priest 1983: 928 refer to fifteen judges and three kings (Saul, David and Solomon) and the nineteen kings of the northern kingdom, so that the word *annus* ("year") is a cipher for a ruler. Tromp 1993: 154 notes this symbolism and its uniqueness in T. Mos. and suggests that, given the difficulty of enumerating the precise number of judges, the years are best understood as relative periods of time, in a similar way to the "hours" of 1 En. 89:72; 90:5 (See Black and VanderKam 1985: 273, 75). The text seems to refer to the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon. The ten tribes who break loose will sacrifice their children, "erect idols in the tabernacle" (*ponient idola scenae*) and act wickedly "in the house of the Lord" (*domo domini*). These verses describe the apostasy of the northern tribes, and have no immediate bearing on the Second Temple period, although the pattern is repeated by the author's contemporaries. The beginning of their apostasy is "surrounding themselves with walls" (*circumvalabunt muros*), something repeated by the parts of the tribes who rebuild Jerusalem after the exile (4:7–9).

258 This refers either to the moving of the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6), or the transfer of the ark and its contents into the temple (1 Kings 8:4–6). Tromp 1993: 156 connects it with the separation of the two tribes from the other ten. They are designated holy tribes because the temple is in their territory (Ps 78:67–71).

259 History is dischronologised here with the transfer of the tabernacle to Jerusalem after the schism, rather than before it as in 2 Sam 6. The manuscript is badly damaged at this point, and several emendations and reconstructions are necessary (Tromp, *ibid.*: 8, 137). The above rendering follows Tromp's emendations. Priest 1983: 928 notes the difficulty with the text and paraphrases, "the twelve tribes will move the tent of testimony to the place where the God of heaven will build a place for his sanctuary." However, the text does not refer to "twelve" tribes, and this paraphrase also attempts to repair the dischronologisation.

260 Koester 1989: 45–46.

and the two tribes, the exile ensues and, from this point on, the significance of the temple and cultus changes.²⁶¹

In T. Mos. 4:7 either the temple or Jerusalem is called “a place” (*locus*).²⁶² The context is the return from the exile, where “some parts of the tribes” (*aliquae partes tribuum*) “enter their appointed place” (*venient in locum constitutum suum*), “surround it with walls, and restore it” (*circumvallabunt locum renovantes*).²⁶³ On the other hand, the “two tribes” (*duae tribus*) weep and mourn, being unable to bring offerings to the Lord of their ancestors. Since no reason is given for their inability to sacrifice, considerable debate has

261 Ibid.: 93–94.

262 Charles 1913a: 415 connects the statement of 1:17 that Joshua had to store the books Moses would give him in “the place that God made from the beginning of the world” (*in loco quem fecit ab initio orbis terrarum*), with the so-called *omphalos* myth, the understanding that Jerusalem (the temple) was the navel of the earth and the beginning of creation. This reading is also adopted by Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 3. In Greek tradition *omphalos* mythology was centred at Delphi while in the OT it was connected with Jerusalem (see e.g. Ezek 38:12). See Terrien 1970: 315–38. Elsewhere, Jerusalem and the temple are the centre of the earth, as in Ezek 5:5; 1 En. 26:1; 90:26; Jub. 8:12. See Schäfer 1978: 122–33; Levenson 1985: 115–26. While this reading is possible, it is unlikely, since the same phrase is used of Moses himself in 1:14 (he was prepared to be a mediator of the covenant “from the beginning of the world,” *ab initio orbis terrarum*), and 12:4 (where God is said to have seen all the nations of the earth from the beginning). The issue here is God’s comprehensive, pre-ordained plan (see Tiede 1973: 90). Moreover, T. Mos is aware that the temple was not built until after the death of Solomon (2:4) and was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (3:2), yet the books would remain in this place until the Lord visits them at the end of days (1:18). See Tromp 1993: 146–47. The text should be read as referring to a primordial decision of God that there would be a mediator of his covenant (Moses), and that God prepared a place for the revelation Moses is about to give to Joshua from the beginning, prior to the construction of the temple. See also Kolenkow 1973: 73. *Locus* (“place”) appears elsewhere in T. Mos. in a general sense (2:2; 6:3; 7:10; 11:5, 7). In 8:5 the central shrine of a temple (either a pagan temple or the Jerusalem temple, see Tromp 1993: 220–21) is referred to as “their secret place” (*abditum locum eorum*), and in 10:9 the heavenly temple is referred to as “the place of God’s habitation” (*loco habitationis*). I discuss this text further below.

263 There is some debate as to whether this place is Jerusalem or the temple. The reference to walls suggests the city (Tromp 1993: 181), while the reference to sacrifices in v. 8 suggests the temple (Goldstein 1973: 49; Collins 1973b: 43; Schwartz 1980: 217–23). See Matt 24:15; John 4:20; 11:48; Acts 6:13–14; 21:28 for evidence for the Greek word *τόπος* being used to refer to the temple in the first century. In 2 Chr 6:40 מִקְדָּשׁ is rendered *τόπος* in the LXX and *locus* in the Vulgate. Whether a strong distinction should be maintained between city and temple is also debateable. The temple dominated the city and was by far its most significant feature. See Davies 1974: 152; Sanders 1992: 51–69. See also Koester 1972: 188–89 for *τόπος* in the sense of a holy place.

developed, centring on the different groups that are referred to. In 4:7 some parts of the tribes go up and enter their appointed place; in 4:8 two tribes are contrasted with these tribes. The tribes that do not go up maintain the allegiance ordained for them, and weep and mourn because they cannot sacrifice; and in v. 9 ten tribes no longer exist. The identity of the ten tribes is clear, but the distinction between the two tribes who remain faithful and the parts of the tribes who go up and rebuild the city/temple is unclear.

The solution to the question of the identity of the two groups is connected with the rebuilding of the city/temple, which appears to be a sinful act. The same word (*circumvallabunt*, “surround with walls”) also appears in 2:7, where it is the beginning of apostasy. Thus, rebuilding after the exile is to be seen as an act of unfaithfulness, while those who remain faithful, and weep and mourn because they cannot sacrifice, withdraw from the cultus of the rebuilt temple. This text, too, evidences dissatisfaction with the second temple and its cultus.²⁶⁴

This reading is supported by the immediately following reference to God's punishment through the foreign kings (5:1–3), leading Israel to turn away from the truth. This statement is supported by the quotation of an unidentifiable text,²⁶⁵ which claims that “they will defile the house of their worship with pollution” (*contaminabunt iniquationibus domum servitutis suae*, 5:3),²⁶⁶ and that certain people “who are not priests but slaves born of slaves” (*qui non sunt sacerdotes, sed servi de servus nati*) will “defile the altar” (*alterium inquinabunt*) with the offerings they bring to the Lord (5:4).²⁶⁷ The surrounding verses enlarge upon their moral misconduct in terms of adultery with foreign gods,

264 Here, I follow Tromp 1993: 180–82. Schwartz 1980: 217–23 and Doran 1987: 491–92 argue that these two tribes who remain faithful are those who remain in Babylon and are too far from Jerusalem to sacrifice. As Tromp 1993: 181–82, notes the author of T. Mos. is more likely to have described the returnees as the two tribes and those who stayed as part of them. Charles 1913a: 417; Lattey 1942: 13–16; Goldstein 1973: 49; Collins 1973b: 43 see this text as evidence of dissatisfaction with the temple and cultus, while Klinzing 1971: 159–60 proposes that the weeping shows their high estimate of the temple. Priest 1983: 929 is unsure whether a definitive interpretation is possible.

265 Tromp 1993: 190–91. The author may have been quoting from memory or giving a paraphrase. Deut 31:29 and Jer 11:10 express similar ideas.

266 *Domus servitutis* (“house of slavery”) refers to Egypt in Exod 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12 (Vulg. 6:13); 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10; Josh 24:17; Judg 6:8; Jer 34:13; 4 Esd 1:7. In Mic 6:4 the same phrase is rendered by *domus servientium*. In the present context, the reference is surely to the temple (ibid.: 191).

267 Josephus (*Ant.* 13.292) mentions and denies the claim that the mother of Hyrcanus was a slave under Antiochus. Charles 1913a: 418 suggests that these statements suit Jason and Menelaus, priests who preceded the Maccabees.

bribery, crime and injustice against God, and impious, partial judges. Chapter 6 continues by referring to kings who proclaim themselves priests, who will fail in their moral duty with respect to “the holy of holies” (*sancto sanctiatis*). In all this, the temple and cult are “condemned in extremely radical terms.”²⁶⁸ There are simply no redeeming features and the text displays contempt for both temple and priesthood. The text presents a hopeless situation, with no heavenly temple and no anticipation of an eschatological temple. The situation may have been resolved had the missing parts of the text still been extant.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have surveyed several texts that reflect dissatisfaction with the temple. However, most of them are silent about Jerusalem and the temple, and the dissatisfaction is more implied than explicit. On the other hand, the wilderness tabernacle and Solomon’s temple are viewed as ideal sanctuaries. In some places the defiled second temple is replaced with an eschatological temple that God will build in the future, a concept sometimes traced to Exod 15:17. At times this is pictured as a return to the conditions of Eden or as a new Jerusalem, although it is usually unclear whether the eschatological temple is a structure or a metaphor for the dwelling of God with his people. It is probably the former, located in Zion.

Elsewhere, the second temple is displaced in favour of a heavenly temple, the true dwelling place of God. In BW this temple is a sort of bicameral structure in heaven, although not corresponding precisely to the Jerusalem temple. In T. Levi 3–5, heaven has either three or seven levels of increasing holiness, while in T. Levi 8 there seems to be a single heaven. Neither heaven nor the heavenly temple closely resemble any earthly sanctuary, other than in the most general terms. None of these texts suggest that the earthly temple is a copy of the heavenly temple. Rather, God dwells in the heavenly temple, and while he is envisaged as coming to earth in BW, he alights on a cosmic mountain, seen as the link between earth and heaven. In T. Levi, Levi’s priestly service in heaven also encompasses God’s people on earth.

These texts have implications for the understanding of the temple symbolism of Hebrews. Hebrews is traditionally read as disparaging the tabernacle

²⁶⁸ Tromp 1993: 192. See Tromp’s discussion on pp. 185–99 of the structure, rhetorical features and historical background of this part of T. Mos. He notes that the terms are too general and too vague for precise identification, and argues that the reference is to recent contemporary history and a society that is “diseased in all its branches” (p. 187).

as an inferior copy of the heavenly temple and as being unconcerned with the second temple. I will argue that both of these readings are inadequate. In Hebrews, the tabernacle is nowhere disparaged. As for the temple, again, it is not explicitly mentioned, but I will argue that it lurks beneath the surface as it does in these texts. The temple and the tabernacle prefigure the eschatological dwelling of God with his people and, since the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God has inaugurated the eschatological realities, the earthly sanctuaries have reached their *telos* and God is no longer encountered in them.

Temple Destroyed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Responding to the Fall of the Temple

Introduction

In this chapter I examine a number of texts that respond to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. While I have argued that Hebrews predates that event, these texts are relevant since they reflect ideas current in late first century Judaism. Some of these texts are positive towards the temple, but negative towards priesthood and people, while others are more negative about the temple itself. They all anticipate a rebuilt temple; sometimes an eschatological temple to be built by God and sometimes a new physical temple in Jerusalem.

I consider here the same questions considered in previous chapters. I am concerned with the relationship of the (now destroyed) earthly temple to the heavenly temple and the eschatological temple to be built by God; with attitudes to the wilderness tabernacle reflected in the texts; with the understanding of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people and whether the communities addressed have access to this dwelling in the present; and whether any of these texts refer to sacrificial activity in heaven.

The Fourth Book of Ezra

The Fourth Book of Ezra (4 Ezra)¹ is a Jewish apocalypse appearing as chapters 4–13 of 4 Esdras in the Vulgate.² The work is set in Babylon thirty years after the

1 For the different works associated with the name of Ezra see the table in Metzger 1983: 516. Unless otherwise noted, all English quotations are from the NRSV text of 4 Ezra. Latin quotations are from Fischer, Gribomont, Sparks, Thiele and Weber 1969.

2 For Jewish provenance see Davila 2005b: 136–41, who notes the centrality of Torah (3:19; 5:27; 7:19–20, [79]–[81], [89], [94], 63 [133]; 8:12, 29, 56; 9:11, 29–37; 13:42, 54; 14:21–22), of Zion (5:21–30); and of the people of Israel (6:55–59; 7:10–11; 8:15–16, 26, 45). Ezra mourns the destruction of Jerusalem (3:1), the temple and its sacred contents, and the priesthood (10:20–22), and anticipates the restoration of Zion (10:38–54) and Zion's role in the eschatological battle (13:35–36). Ezra anticipates the coming of the Messiah in 7:28–[44] but nothing in these verses can be related to eschatological scenarios found in the NT. Moreover, the virgin birth, the earthly life, and the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus are absent from 4 Ezra. Fourth

exile (3:1–3), a fictional literary device modelled on Ezek 1:1.³ The name Ezra, is a pseudonym in whose name the book was written by an anonymous Jew, probably living in Palestine⁴ in the final years of the first century CE.⁵ Thus, the destruction of the second temple is described “in the code of 587,”⁶ as though it was Solomon’s temple.⁷ The original language seems to have been Hebrew,⁸ but no Hebrew text has survived. There was probably an early Greek translation, but evidence for this in quotations and allusions in some early Christian

Esdras 1–2 (5 Ezra); 15–16 (6 Ezra) is a Christian framework placed around 4 Ezra from the second and third centuries (DeSilva 2002: 324, 346–51). These chapters are beyond the my scope since they did not exist in the immediate aftermath of the events of 70 CE, although they do set the context in which 4 Ezra is now to be read.

- 3 The reference to thirty years has been used as a guide to the date of the book, but it is more likely that it imitates Ezek 1:1, see Stone 1990: 55.
- 4 The evidence for the location of 4 Ezra is slim. Davila 2005b: 138–39 refers to a consensus that the work emanated from Palestine; Longenecker 1995: 15–16; 1997: 271–93 argues that the author was a scribe associated with Yavneh, and Stone 1989: 18 suggests someone “steeped in one aspect of Pharisaic tradition.”
- 5 This date arises from the identification of the three heads of the eagle in 4 Ezra 11–12 as Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. Since two of these had died (11:33–35; 12:23–27) and the third was expected to die with the advent of the Messiah in the last days (12:28), a date late in the reign of Domitian is likely. See Grabbe and Charlesworth 1981: 51–52; Stone 1984: 412; 1989: 7–11; 1990: 10, 366–71; Willett 1989: 53; Hallbäck 1992: 270–71; Longenecker 1995: 13–16; Collins 1998: 195–96; Lichtenberger 1999: 239; DeSilva 2002: 330–32; Harrington 2003a: 665; Nickelsburg 2005: 275. For a review of the history of scholarship on the dating of 4 Ezra, including the historical problems associated with this so-called “Flavian” dating, see DiTommaso 1999: 3–38. DiTommaso argues that the eagle vision is an interpolation from the early third century. He argues that while the book requires an eagle vision at this point, it does not require the actual eagle vision that is extant in the book, and he considers that only with great difficulty can the historical details of this eagle vision be identified with events of the late first century. The weakness of his argument is the lack of any evidence for an alternative eagle vision. DiTommaso does accept a date around the end of the first century for the composition of the remainder of the book, although he does not specify his grounds for this opinion. Clement of Alexandria cites 4 Ezra 5:35 in *Stromateis*, which can be dated around the end of the second century, but this is of no consequence for DiTommaso’s argument, since Clement does not cite the eagle vision.
- 6 Kirschner 1985: 29–30.
- 7 Solomon’s temple itself is absent from the text, although it is co-terminus with the city (3:24; 10:46). No temple is mentioned in the heavenly city to be revealed (10:44–56; 13:36). Wardle 2010: 91 finds this “striking,” but since it is a “building” (10:55) it probably incorporates the temple as in 3:24; 10:46.
- 8 Myers 1974: 115–17; Stone 1990: 10–11; DeSilva 2002: 329.

works may simply represent dependence on common traditions.⁹ Versions in several different languages remain, the most important of which are Latin and Syriac.¹⁰

That 4 Ezra concentrates on Solomon's temple indicates the same sort of dissatisfaction with the second temple that appears elsewhere in the literature. The implication is that the "real" temple was Solomon's rather than Herod's. As the narrative proceeds, it becomes clear that the city built by God to be revealed at the end exceeds Solomon's temple in significance.

The book contains seven episodes: three dialogues with the angel Uriel, three visions and an epilogue.¹¹ The first dialogue begins when Ezra is on his bed, distressed at the desolation of Zion and the wealth of "Babylon" (3:1–3), a cipher for Rome.¹² He brings his complaint to God (3:4–36), Uriel responds, and then Ezra and Uriel embark on a vigorous debate (4:1–5:13) that continues until Ezra awakes (5:14–20). This pattern of distress, followed by complaint, debate and conclusion, is repeated twice more in Ezra's room over the space of three weeks (5:21–6:34; 6:35–9:25). At the end of the third dialogue, Uriel sends Ezra out into a field to eat the flowers and pray (9:24–25), and wait until he comes to speak with him.

Ezra is still distressed when he receives the first vision (9:26–10:59), a woman grieving at the recent loss of her son. While he consoles her, she is transformed into a glorious city, which Uriel identifies as the restored Zion. Ezra's second vision (11:1–12:51) is of an eagle with three heads and numerous wings rising out of the sea. It is ultimately destroyed by a lion. Uriel identifies the eagle as the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision (Dan 7:7–8, 23–25) and the lion as the Messiah. In Ezra's final vision (13:1–58) a man rises out of the sea and stands on a mountain that he had carved out for himself. Uriel identifies the

9 Stone 1990: 1–2.

10 Ibid.: 1–9. Stone discusses the importance of the Syriac and Latin versions on p. 3. The most convenient text is that in the Latin Vulgate (Fischer, Gribomont, Sparks, Thiele and Weber 1969: 1931–74). The Syriac text is found in Bidawid 1973. I have not been able to access the critical edition of the Latin text in Klijn 1983b.

11 Metzger 1983: 517–18; Stone 1990: 50. Humphrey 1995: 59 refers to all seven episodes as visions and, indeed, Stone notes that a vision can be auditory as well as visual. Nevertheless, I follow Sanders 1985b: 409–18; Vermes 1986: 294–98; Collins 1998: 200–10; Lichtenberger 1999: 240 in referring to three dialogues, three visions and an epilogue. This clarifies the auditory nature of the first three episodes and the combination of visual and auditory features in the next three. The epilogue is also auditory, although here the Lord speaks rather than Uriel.

12 This literary device appears in several works of the period (e.g. Rev 18; Sib. Or. 5:130). See Harrington 2003b: 349.

mountain as Zion and the man as the Son of God who will destroy the enemies of God's people. These three visions transform Ezra's distress into joy, and he praises God who governs times and events. God appears to Ezra in an epilogue (14:1–48) and commissions him to comfort and instruct the people and to rewrite the Scriptures that were destroyed along with the temple.¹³

Earlier scholars argued that 4 Ezra was a conglomeration of sources,¹⁴ but Breech demonstrates that it is a carefully structured narrative showing "Ezra's movement from distress [at the loss of Jerusalem and the temple] to consolation by the Most High himself who reveals to the prophet, in dream visions, his end time plans."¹⁵ These plans involve God's actions to redeem his people. Central to this is the restoration of Zion "prepared and built, as you saw the mountain carved out without hands" (13:36) from where God will destroy their enemies.

The First Dialogue (3:1–5:20)

Here, Ezra prays in his distress, rehearsing the history of the world from the creation to the time when David builds a city (*civitas*) for God's name, in which to offer oblations (3:24). These were offered for many years, until God gave the city over to the hand of his enemies because of the transgressions of the people. While Ezra never mentions the temple,¹⁶ the temple is subsumed under the identity of the city built to offer oblations to God. For Ezra, "the city is

13 Knibb 1982: 62–63; Hallböck 1992: 273; Lichtenberger 1999: 248. DeSilva 2002: 336–37 suggests that the major purpose of 4 Ezra is, "the reinforcement of Torah observance as a positive and necessary value."

14 E.g. Box 1913: 549–52. See the discussions in Longenecker 1995: 22–24; Collins 1998: 196–98; DeSilva 2002: 335–36.

15 Breech 1973: 269. See also the comprehensive discussion in Stone 1990: 11–23, especially pp. 21–23. Esler 1994: 99–123 argues that the purpose of 4 Ezra is to manage the cognitive dissonance between the experience of the destruction of the temple and the theology of election. He notes "it is clear that the author of 4 Ezra, and presumably his readers, did consider that the sack of Jerusalem in 70 CE and the enslavement and exile of many Jews thereafter were grossly inconsistent with theological views on the election of Israel and the significance of the Temple" (p. 106).

16 The Syriac version adds "and a house" (ܒܝܬܐ). In 10:46 Solomon builds the city and offers sacrifices in it, although in the OT Solomon built the temple rather than the city. Fisher 1963: 34–41 argues for a wider semantic range than just "city" for the Hebrew word עיר, positing a sense such as "temple quarter" or "hill of God/altar." In Ezek 40:2 Ezekiel sees a structure like a city that turns out to be the temple area in v. 5 (Koester 1989: 18–19). See also Isa 60:7, 13, 14; Zech 8:3. Fisher 1963: 40 suggests, "ideally, YHWH does not have a temple quarter within a city but the city is his temple quarter, temple and even the Hill of God."

clearly the sanctuary.”¹⁷ The key to understanding the narrative that follows is found in Uriel’s response, “Your understanding has utterly failed regarding this world.” As the narrative unfolds, it becomes clear that while Ezra is thinking of the earthly Zion that has been devastated, Uriel responds in terms of the heavenly Zion.

The Second Dialogue (5:21–6:34)

In 5:23–30 Ezra recounts the uniqueness of Israel. God chose one vine, one region, one lily, one river, one city, one dove, one sheep and one people. The vine is clearly Israel,¹⁸ as are the dove (Ps 74:19) and the sheep;¹⁹ the region is apparently the land, the river is the Jordan, but the city is named: “from all the cities that have been built (*aedificatis civitatibus*) you have consecrated (*sanctificasti*, *לִקְדַּשְׁתָּ*) Zion for yourself” (5:25). Why then, Ezra asks, has the one been given over to the many?

Ezra’s description of Zion as a “built city” is ironic, for elsewhere in 4 Ezra the built city is the heavenly Jerusalem (10:27, 42, 44; 13:36; see also Ps 122:3).²⁰ So while in 5:25 he sees the built city, Zion that has been destroyed, it soon becomes clear that there is more to the destroyed Zion than Ezra sees.

In 6:1–6 Uriel explains, with a series of divine passives, that God had planned and made all things before the creation, including the establishment of “the footstool which is Zion (*aestimaretur scabillum Sion*, 6:4).”²¹ While David might have built Zion, Zion was planned by God before the creation. This, as well as other texts in 4 Ezra that describe the heavenly Jerusalem as the “built city,” indicate that the earthly city/temple corresponds in some way with the heavenly city/temple, and while the earthly may be in ruins, the heavenly remains intact, ready to be revealed as the world to come.²²

The Third Dialogue (6:35–9:25)

What is implicit about the two cities becomes explicit in the third dialogue when Ezra asks why Israel did not possess the world as an inheritance and

17 Stone 1990: 74. See also Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4; Myers 1974: 171; Lee 2001: 129–32. The Armenian version expands the text to explain that Solomon built the temple (Stone 1990: 74).

18 Ps 80:8; Isa 5:1–7; Hos 14:17.

19 E.g. Ps 80:1; Jer 23:1–4; Ezek 34.

20 See the discussion in Stone (ibid.: 129–30).

21 Translation from Stone 1990: 157. For YHWH’s footstool see 1 Chr 28:2; Ps 99:5; 110:1; 132:7; Isa 66:1; Lam 2:1.

22 Wardle 2010: 91; Moffitt 2011: 100–101.

how long the present situation would continue.²³ Uriel responds in 7:26–[44] with an eschatological scenario, “Indeed the time will come, when . . . the city that now is not seen shall appear, and the land that now is hidden shall be disclosed.”²⁴ This city is the heavenly Jerusalem, whose eschatological appearance is portrayed in the fourth vision (see below).²⁵ And, while Ezra thinks of land in terms of the land of Israel,²⁶ the land Uriel refers to is Paradise,²⁷ the location of the heavenly, unseen city. This city and land, the world to come,²⁸ are real in the eschatological present, even though hidden from view.²⁹

That paradise is in view is confirmed in 7:36, where Uriel uses two sets of parallel terms for the disclosure of eschatological end of the wicked and the righteous respectively: the pit of torment³⁰ opposite the place of rest and the furnace of Hell opposite the Paradise of delight.³¹ Stone remarks that rest is a standard feature of Jewish eschatology, referring to Ps 95:11; Isa 14:7. Significant also, are such texts as 2 Sam 7:1 and 1 Kings 5:4, where God gives David and Solomon rest from their enemies and they decide to build a house for God’s name, and 2 Chr 6:41–7:3 where Solomon invites YHWH to enter his resting place and the glory of the Lord fills the temple. The paradise of delight is where God rested at the creation (Gen 2:2; Heb 4:4), that is, the heavenly temple, which will be disclosed in the eschaton.³²

23 The question in 4 Ezra 6:54–59 is posed in terms of Ps 8 (Peeler 2014: 72–73), a key text in Hebrews.

24 Here I follow Stone (*ibid.*: 202, see also notes f and g) and the NRSV. Both follow the Armenian version, which refers to a city. The textual witnesses for this line are “chaotic” (Stone, p. 202).

25 For the ideal future Jerusalem see Isa 52:1; 54:11–12; 60:10–22; Ezek 40–48; Zech 2:10–12; Tob 13:16–18; 14:5; T. Dan 5:12; 2 En. 55:2; 2 Bar 4:2–4; 32:2–4; 11QNJ. See also Gal 4:26; Heb 11:10–16; 12:22; 13:14; Rev 21–22; b. Hag. 12b.

26 Box 1913: 582. See also 8:52 which juxtaposes city and land.

27 Hofius 1970b: 182–83 (note 368); Knibb and Coggins 1979: 167; Willett 1989: 73; Lee 2001: 132–33. Stone 1989: 102–3, 197–98 argues that this identification is not certain, since in 4 Ezra paradise is nowhere described in terms of “land.”

28 Moffitt 2011: 96–105.

29 Stone 1990: 213–14 notes that this sort of terminology is “a standard part of apocalyptic mystification.”

30 Stone (*ibid.*: 203) retains the word Gehenna from the Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic and Georgian versions.

31 Hofius 1970b: 61; Laansma 1997: 107–108.

32 Stone 1990: 221 suggests that “[t]he term ‘paradise of delight’ is probably a literal translation of the rendering of ‘Garden of Eden’ in Greek as *παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς*.” See 1989: 197–204 for Stone’s treatment of paradise. Care must be taken with the distinction between earth and heaven in the discussion of paradise in 4 Ezra, and it is probably overstating the case to claim that paradise refers to some transcendental and heavenly garden simply on the

The eschatological disclosure of the heavenly city/temple becomes clear in the reference to paradise in 8:52, where Uriel lists the features of the world to come:³³ for “Ezra and those like him,”³⁴ paradise is opened, the tree of life planted, the age to come prepared, plenty provided, a city built, rest appointed, goodness established and wisdom perfected. This piling up of the features of the world to come describes the eschatological reward of the righteous.³⁵ Strict differentiation of the terms seems unwarranted; rather, they represent different aspects of the eschatological dwelling of God and his people.³⁶ That the “built city” is paired with the “appointed rest” indicates that “rest” should be understood in a local sense as “a place of rest.”³⁷

The First Vision (9:26–10:59)

Following these dialogues Ezra sees the eschatological events hinted at in the dialogues in three visions.³⁸ The first vision is pivotal, as Ezra begins to see what Uriel had previously told him would happen.³⁹ Distressed, and out in a field eating flowers (9:27), he sees a woman grieving at the recent death of

basis that it is said to have been pre-created (3:6), as does Box 1912: 195–97. See b. Ned. 39b; b. Pesah. 54a; Pirke R. El. 3; Midr. Ps. 72:66 and 90:13 (where the temple is the heavenly temple); Tg. Onq. (Grossfeld 1988: 45, note 5) and Tg. Ps.-J. (Maher 1992: 22, note 23) on Gen 2:8; and Tg. Ps.-J on Gen 3:24 for the suggestion that the Garden of Eden was built before the creation (along with the throne of glory, the name of the Messiah, Torah, Israel, Gehenna, repentance and the Temple). Stone 1989: 200–204 argues that paradise in 7:36 is simply the earthly garden of Eden. But it seems valid to treat paradise in the same way as the heavenly Zion, for that too was established at the creation (6:4) and will be revealed in the end (7:26). The relationship between the heavenly and earthly dimensions of paradise and Zion is complex, but in the eschaton, what is now concealed (in heaven) will be revealed (on earth). In the story of the four who entered פֶּרֶדֶס, found in t. Hag. 2.1; y. Hag. 77b; b. Hag. 14b–15b; Song of Songs Rab. 1.44, as well as in Hekhalot Zutarti and Merkabah Rabbah, paradise seems to be identified with the heavenly temple. For a convenient translation of the texts see Morray-Jones 1993: 196–98, 210–17, and the discussion on pp. 199–202, 207–8.

33 Verses 53–54 list what will be absent from the world to come.

34 Stone 1990: 286. The Latin “you” at the start of v. 52 is plural (*vobis*), as also the Syriac (ܚܝܬܝܢ) and all other versions apart from the Armenian.

35 Stone 1989: 218; 1990: 288.

36 On this cf. Stone 1990: 287, “[i]n 4 Ezra, we should observe, heavenly Jerusalem is usually related to the ‘messianic kingdom’ complex of ideas, and this is not readily to be reconciled with its connection with paradise in a number of contexts.”

37 Hofius 1970b: 62.

38 Longenecker 1991: 111.

39 Stone 1981: 202–3; 1990: 304; Longenecker 1995: 58–64; Humphrey 1995: 59; Lichtenberger 1999: 242; Lee 2001: 134–35; DeSilva 2002: 327.

her only son on his wedding day. Ezra attempts to console her, reminding her that the distress of the community was greater than her distress, for while she was grieving for one son, the community was grieving for the whole world. Moreover, the sanctuary and its furnishings had been destroyed; the priests, the Levites and the people had been killed or exiled; and the seal of the glory of Zion had been given over into the hands of their enemies (10:21–24).⁴⁰

At this point, the woman is transformed into a city. Uriel arrives on the scene and identifies the city as the restored Zion that was to be revealed at the end of time.⁴¹ What the reader had suspected from the analogy between the grief of the woman over her son and the grief of Ezra over Zion is now made explicit. The woman is the desolate Zion and also the renewed Zion.⁴² Uriel encourages Ezra to enter the city, noting that there will be limitations on what he can see and hear. He is entering God's realm, which transcends human comprehension.⁴³

Uriel explains the vision to the perplexed Ezra in 10:38–59, picking up features from the earlier dialogues. Instead of the woman he sees a “city being established” (*civitas aedificabatur*, 10:27),⁴⁴ a place of huge foundations (*locus . . . de fundamentis magnis*) identified as Zion in 10:44. The city “appears” (10:27, 42, 44) as predicted in 7:26. Its description as an “established city” and the reference to foundations identifies it with the heavenly Jerusalem.⁴⁵ Finally, in 10:55 the city becomes a building. Ezra is encouraged to enter it and see “the splendour and vastness of the building” (*ingredere et vide splendorem*

40 Cf. the lament for Zion in 4 Ezra 10:21–24 with 1 Macc 2:7–12 and 4Q179 I.

41 See 5:25; 7:26; 8:52.

42 Lichtenberger 1999: 243–45. DeSilva 2002: 328 (note 4) suggests that the woman represents the earthly Zion, which “even though now mourning and childless, is not bereft of glory. God has prepared an eternal Zion, so that the earthly city, now broken and desolate, is seen by Ezra to have a glorious future.” The distinction between the earthly Zion and the heavenly Zion is complex in 4 Ezra, and it seems likely that the heavenly Zion will ultimately come to earth (as in Rev 21–22) and stand in the place of the now desolate earthly Zion. See Longenecker 1995: 68; Nickelsburg 2005: 273–74; Gäbel 2006: 101–2.

43 Stone 2007: 402–7 argues that the limitations on Ezra's ability to see and hear what he encounters in the city/building in 4 Ezra 13:55–56 indicate that the city is a metaphor for the heavenly realm where God dwells.

44 This description is emphasised with double repetition in 10:42, 44. See Lee 2001: 135. In the Latin text the city was being built (*aedificabatur*, imperfect indicative). The Syriac and Ethiopic versions refer to “an established city” (NRSV Marg).

45 For the foundations of Jerusalem see Ps 87:1; Isa 54:11. In Rev 21:14, 19 the new Jerusalem has foundations that are identified as the apostles, reflecting the idea of the community as a temple (Beale 1999: 1069–71). In Heb 11:10 Abraham is said to have looked for a city with foundations; that is, the heavenly Jerusalem.

vel magnitudinem aedificii).⁴⁶ That it is a building recalls the identification of the city with the temple in 3:24.⁴⁷

The Third Vision (13:1–58)

The final reference to the city in 4 Ezra is in the third vision,⁴⁸ that of the man who will emerge from the sea (the Messiah) and carve out a great mountain (13:6–7) without hands (13:36).⁴⁹ In 13:35–36 the mountain is identified as “Zion”, which will “come and be revealed to all people” (*Sion autem veniet et ostendetur omnibus*). It is also described as “prepared and built” (*parata et aedificata*), which recalls the earlier references to the built city (5:24; 10:27).

This imagery forms a fitting climax to the book. It clarifies the centrality of Zion, now identified as the heavenly Jerusalem, prepared and built by the Lord, hidden from human view, but to be revealed at the end of time as the place from where God will judge and destroy his enemies.

Conclusion

Zion is central in 4 Ezra. It is the desolate place Ezra mourns and it becomes the locus of Ezra’s eschatological hopes. It is difficult, however, to distinguish the earthly Zion from the heavenly and, indeed, they seem to refer to the same reality. Both were planned and made by God, although David did build the earthly Zion. The language of copy is less appropriate than the language of identification. In the eschaton, the earthly and the heavenly Zion seem to merge when sovereignty is restored to the people of God, thus satisfying Ezra’s hopes (6:59) at the place where his distress first became apparent.

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch

Syriac Baruch (2 Baruch) is an apocalypse⁵⁰ written by a “Torah-observant Jew”⁵¹ Like 4 Ezra it is fictionally set around the time of the exile of the

46 The Ethiopic version has Ezra seeing the vastness of the walls and the Armenian version adds “of that city” (Stone 1990: 340).

47 See also 10:46. See Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4; Stone 1990: 337.

48 The Eagle Vision (4 Ezra 11–12) is a key part of the text, but contains no temple imagery.

49 For the expression “without hands” as a reference to the eschatological temple see Mark 14:58; Acts 7:48; Heb 8:2; 9:11. See also Dan 2:34–35.

50 Davila 2005b: 126; Gurtner 2009: 18–20. Note e.g. the angel Ramail who reveals the interpretation of Baruch’s dream vision in 55:3–74:4.

51 Davila 2005b: 128–30; Gurtner 2009: 13. Davila notes the centrality of the Torah, the Jewish nationalistic identity, the lack of distinctly Christian features in the eschatology of the

southern kingdom and written in the name of Jeremiah's illustrious scribe (Jer 36:32), who has now become an apocalyptic seer and Jeremiah's "legitimate prophetic successor."⁵² This is a literary device, since the work clearly post-dates the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.⁵³ It was probably written prior to 135 CE.⁵⁴ It is extant in a single Syriac manuscript from the sixth or seventh century,⁵⁵ as well as in some Syriac, Latin and Greek fragments, and an Arabic translation.⁵⁶ The Syriac version seems to be a translation from Greek, but whether or not there was a Semitic original is debated.⁵⁷ A relationship exists between 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, although its precise nature has eluded scholars.⁵⁸

The structure of 2 Baruch is complex, and several schemes have been proposed, mostly involving seven sections, although scholars differ on their

book, and the absence of any reference to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Nir 2003: 3–15, 199–201 (and *passim*) argues that it is a Christian work preserved by Christians because the picture of the Messiah appears more Christian than Jewish. As Davila 2005b: 131 suggests, Nir's work rather than establishing Christian authorship of 2 Baruch shows how it might be relevant for Christians. See also Henze 2006: 158 (note 4); Gurtner 2009: 14. It is apparent that in his emphasis on law and covenant, Baruch is presented as a second Moses, see Murphy 1985b: 117–34; Gurtner 2009: 14–15.

- 52 Wright 1998: 271–76, 284 (quote from p. 275); Gurtner 2009: 2. Baruch is never referred to as a scribe in 2 Bar., and in 2:1–2; 5:5; 10:2–4 Baruch speaks the word of the Lord to Jeremiah and not the other way around, showing that "Baruch is a prophet in his own right and successor to Jeremiah" (Henze 2006: 166).
- 53 Hobbins 1998: 48; Nir 2003: 1; Davila 2005b: 126–27. Gurtner 2008: 23; 2009: 16–18, 27–32, argues that the reference to the "twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah" in 2 Bar. 1:1 indicates that it is to be dated in 95 CE (twenty-five years after the fall of the temple). Roddy 1996: 3–14 argues from 2 Bar. 28:2 that it was written around 95 CE and that Baruch expected the end in 99 CE. See the response to Roddy in Laato 1998: 39–46, who considers that Baruch expected the end around 139 CE.
- 54 2 Bar. 32:2–4 refers to the destruction of the temple, but there is no reference to the Bar Kokhba revolt of 135. There may be an allusion to 2 Bar. 61:7 in Barn. 11:9, although this is doubted by some scholars (e.g. Saylor 1984: 110). The date of Barnabas is debated, although the range is similar to that of 2 Baruch (Holmes 2007: 373).
- 55 Lied 2008: 21; Gurtner 2009: 6–7.
- 56 Gurtner 2009: 6–8. The Arabic translation is of a *Vorlage* related to, but not identical with, the Syriac ms. On the nature of this translation see Leemhuis 1989: 19–26. Thirty-six Syriac MSS of 2 Bar. 78–87, (the Epistle of Second Baruch) are also extant (Gurtner, pp. 9–10).
- 57 Davila 2005a: 59–60; Gurtner 2009: 10–13.
- 58 Davila 2005b: 127 suggests that 4 Ezra has influenced 2 Baruch, as does Collins 1998: 222–24 (although tentatively). See the discussions in Nickelsburg 2005: 283–86; Gurtner 2009: 15–16.

precise delineation.⁵⁹ Earlier scholars detected a variety of documents behind the text, and referred to Baruch as an editor rather than an author.⁶⁰ More recent scholars, while not denying the use of sources, argue that the work is a literary unity.⁶¹ This question impinges on the issue of the temple, since different attitudes to the temple surface in different parts of 2 Baruch.⁶² That there seem to be contradictions in our minds in the understanding of the symbols of an ancient work need not lead to theories of editorial compilation. This text grapples with significant issues, and while one solution suggests itself in one place, another may suggest itself elsewhere.⁶³

Section 1 (2 Bar. 1:1–5:7)

The opening words announce that in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah of Judah the word of the Lord came upon Baruch. The Lord declared that the wickedness of the two southern tribes was worse than that of the ten northern tribes and that he was about to bring evil upon the city and its inhabitants. The city would be taken away for a time and the people would be scattered among the Gentiles. Baruch responds (3:1–9),⁶⁴ referring to the city as his mother,⁶⁵ and pointing out that if God were to do this, the name of Israel would be no longer remembered. Nobody would speak the Lord's praises, there would be none to receive Torah instruction, the world would return to its "natural state" and to

59 See e.g. Klijn 1983a: 615 (who summarises the contents into twelve sections); 1989: 4–7; Saylor 1984 (who retains seven sections, but omits any reference to the Epistle); Murphy 1985b: 11–29; Willett 1989: 80–95 (who has eight sections, including the Epistle); Whitters 2003: 35–48; Gurtner 2009: 21–24. Hobbins 1998: 53–54 has a fourfold structure, and Henze 2010: 426–27 argues for three parts (1–9; 10–77; 78–87), with the long central part containing several "set elements . . . that are frequently repeated." Deciding on a precise structure is not critical for this study, and I follow Gurtner's outline. Unless otherwise noted, I use the text and translation in Gurtner 2009.

60 E.g. Charles 1913e: 474–76.

61 Bogaert 1969: 1: 56–81; Saylor 1984: 4–6; Murphy 1985b: 2–3; Collins 1998: 214–16; Lied 2008: 24–26; Henze 2010: 428. Murphy 1985a: 2 describes Charles's approach as "scissors-and-paste," a process quite different from the author's use of sources to compose a new and coherent work.

62 Hobbins 1998: 49–51; Collins 1998: 215. I discuss these different attitudes as they arise.

63 See Collins 1998 215, "an apocalypse does not aspire to formulate doctrine in a consistent way, but to suggest future hope by means of symbols."

64 This is the start of the extended dialogue between God and Baruch that characterises all of 2 Baruch (Henze 2006: 163).

65 For the imagery of the city as a mother and the inhabitants as her children see Isa 49:20–22, 25; 50:1; 51:18, 20; 54:1; Jer 50:12; Ezek 16:20–21, 36; Hos 4:5; Bar 4:8–5:9; 4 Ezra 5:50; 10:6–8; Gal 4:25–26.

silence, and humanity would be destroyed. This symbolic destruction of the world and humanity along with the city, and the ensuing dialogue imply that the city stands for the temple.⁶⁶

In his reply, God refers to the city (ܐܬܝܪ 4:1–2) and then to the building (ܐܬܝܪ 4:3)⁶⁷ that he showed to Adam in paradise,⁶⁸ to Abraham,⁶⁹ and to Moses when he showed him the pattern of the tabernacle (ܐܬܝܪ ܡܕܝܢܐ 4:5) and all its vessels.⁷⁰ Baruch responds in 5:1 in terms of Zion, “this place” (ܐܬܝܪ ܐܬܝܪ)⁷¹ and “your sanctuary” (ܐܬܝܪܐܝܢ).⁷² As elsewhere,⁷³ this text reflects the cosmic nature of the temple. While no temple is mentioned, the return of the cosmos to silence (3:4–6), implies that the destruction of the city means the destruction of the temple, and the destruction of the temple means the reversal of creation.

While Baruch responds to the threat of destruction (2 Bar. 3) with arguments for the ongoing significance of the city and the temple, God responds that he is determined to hand over the city and punish the people “for a time,” but that

66 Murphy 1985b: 71 1987: 671–73; Lee 2001: 150–51; Lied 2008: 35–37; 47–49. On p. 671 Murphy notes that in 2 Baruch “the author does not clearly differentiate between Jerusalem and the Temple. The Temple defines Jerusalem . . . The significance of the loss of Jerusalem is that the Temple no longer exists.” This is similar to 4 Ezra 3:24; 10:46. On the lack of differentiation between the temple and the city, Klijn 1989: 9 suggests that the concern is not really the temple but the “fall of Jerusalem, the City of God.” It is better to see the city/temple as a single complex, so that one is subsumed under the other.

67 The term “building” in 4:3 seems to be a reference to the temple. Bogaert 1969: 1: 422 refers to “l’édifice de Sion.”

68 That God showed the building to Adam perhaps reflects the temple connotations of Eden in such texts as Jub. 3. See also 2 En. 31:2; LAB 26:6.

69 Gen 15:5; 4 Ezra 3:13–14; Gen. Rab. 44:21.

70 2 Bar. 5:5; 59:4 reads Exod 25:8–9, 40 as though God showed Moses the heavenly temple as the pattern of the tabernacle.

71 For “place” (Aramaic ܐܬܝܪ) as the location of the temple see Ezra 5:15; 6:3, 5, 7.

72 Hobbins 1998: 54–55 has a slightly different understanding of the relationship between temple and cosmos. He notes that the relationship in 2 Bar. 1 is expressed in Baruch’s questions and not in God’s statements, and suggests that Baruch enquires whether “the destruction to be wrought on Jerusalem is a foretaste of God’s resolve to destroy the cosmos and the human race altogether.” Be that as it may, that Baruch can ask such questions implies that he made a connection between the temple and the cosmos. Later (p. 55), Hobbins and also Wardle 2010: 91 suggest that 2 Bar. 4:2–6 indicates that the earthly Jerusalem “is only a copy.” Nowhere does the text delineate the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, nor does it use the language of “copy.”

73 E.g. Sir 24; Philo, *Mos.* 2.70–108, 136–140; *QE* 2.68–69; *Her.* 221–229; *Spec.* 1.172; LAB 12:9.

the world would not be forgotten as Baruch had suggested in 3:7.⁷⁴ Then God turns to the heavenly temple, pointing out that the city Baruch sees is not the city engraved on the palms of God's hands, and the building Baruch sees is not the one that was "prepared beforehand from the time when I decided to create paradise." The image of the city engraved on God's hands is from Isa 49:16, and in its context there the reference is to the earthly Jerusalem that God promises not to forget. Baruch's reshaping of the text negates the earthly Jerusalem in favour of the heavenly one.

This dichotomy between the earthly city and temple and the heavenly is striking in the light of the close connection between the two elsewhere in 2 Baruch.⁷⁵ The ideas reflect Ezek 8–10, where the glory of YHWH abandoned the temple. Without the presence of YHWH, the temple is an empty shell. The real Jerusalem and temple are preserved in heaven with God (4:6).⁷⁶

Section 2 (2 Bar. 6:1–9:1)

These chapters recount the destruction of both city and temple,⁷⁷ not by enemies but by four angels, but only after another angel from heaven enters "the holy of holies" (ܠܗܝܠܝܬ ܠܗܝܠܝܬ, 6:7),⁷⁸ takes the contents of the temple and commands the earth to swallow them up for a time. These are hidden in the earth "until the end times," so that they may be restored at the proper time and "so that strangers may not get possession of them" (6:8),⁷⁹ for the time will come

74 Murphy 1985b: 72–92 refers to the form of this interchange as "intercessory bargaining," where God relents and does not carry out the intended punishment. For examples of intercessory bargaining see Num 14:10b–25; 16:19b–24; Exod 32:9–14; Gen 19:1–28. In 2 Bar. 1–5 God does not relent. "Since Baruch bases his intercession on certain views of the Temple, God's failure to agree with him amounts to a rejection of those views. Thus, God himself points out the inadequacy of the Temple ideology behind some responses to the destruction of Jerusalem" (Murphy 1987: 673).

75 The close relationship appears where (in Baruch's mind at least) the loss of the temple means the reversal of creation (see 3:4–9; 10:8–17; 61:1–8).

76 Willett 1989: 85. See also Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4 (who refers to "hostility" against the Jerusalem temple); and Stone 1981: 199–200, who notes, "[f]or all its glory, the earthly Temple . . . does not bear the full weight of the cosmic role. This is reserved for the heavenly Temple."

77 Again, city and temple merge. In 6:4 angels stand at the four corners of the city and in 7:1 they tear down the walls to their foundations, while in 8:1 Baruch hears a voice from within the temple after the wall had fallen, calling the enemies to come. The Chaldeans obey and seize the house and everything around it.

78 This expression only occurs here and in 34:1, where Baruch himself decides to go and enquire of God at the place of the former holy of holies.

79 See 80:2 where only one reason is given, "that they may not be polluted by enemies."

when it is restored “forever” (לְחַיִּים).⁸⁰ This text envisages the restoration of the temple “forever,” together with the reuse of the sacred contents. It makes use of traditions known from elsewhere of the temple utensils being hidden for re-use in the rebuilt (second) temple after the exile.⁸¹ Murphy reads the text as referring to the building of the second temple,⁸² but the consistent use of לְחַיִּים with the sense of “forever” throughout 2 Baruch,⁸³ and especially in 32:4 which refers to an eschatological temple being built “forever,” makes this conclusion difficult to uphold.⁸⁴ It seems, rather, that here also the text anticipates a new (earthly) temple in the eschaton that will endure forever, and in which the sacred contents of the first temple will again be used.⁸⁵ Thus, in 2 Baruch the eschatological temple replaces the destroyed temple and will include a restored sacrificial cult.⁸⁶

The earthly temple has minimal significance in 2 Bar. 4, probably because of the departure of the glory of God from it because of the wickedness of the

80 Gurtner 2009: 37 translates לְחַיִּים with “forever,” while Murphy 1985b: 95 suggests that the sense is “for a long time” (see also p. 21).

81 For a discussion of these traditions see Collins 1972: 97–116; Nickelsburg 1973c: 63–65, 67; Nir 2003: 43–77. See Bar 1:8–10; 2 Macc 2:4–8; 4 Bar. (Paraleipomena Jeremion) 3:9–19; Liv. Pro. (Life of Jeremiah) 2:12.

82 Murphy 1985b: 95; 1987: 679.

83 The expression appears in 5:2 (the name and the glory of the Lord lasting “forever”); 32:4 (the eschatological rebuilding of Zion “forever”); 40:3 (the “enduring” reign of the messiah—in an interim messianic age); 43:1 (“enduring” consolations for Baruch); 44:1 (the “endurance” of the new world); 59:2 (the lamp of the “eternal” law); 66:6 (an “eternal” reward for Josiah); 73:1 (“eternal” peace in the messianic age); 78:6 (“eternal” hope); and 78:7 (God will not forget or forsake his people “forever”). In 14:18 it refers to “the world.”

84 Bogaert 1969: 1: 422. Three temples appear in 32:2–4. They seem to be: (1) the destroyed temple of Solomon; (2) the second temple that will uprooted “after a time” (בְּיָמֵינוּ); and (3) a temple that will be “renewed in glory and perfected forever” (לְחַיִּים בְּכָבוֹד וּבְתִשְׁבָּעָה לְחַיִּים). The use of לְחַיִּים (“forever”) both here and in 6:9 should be read as referring to the same (eschatological) temple.

85 Ibid.: 1: 422; Hobbins 1998: 56–57. Collins 1998: 214–15 refers to an eschatological restoration of the temple, but one that was not imminent, making the heavenly Jerusalem and temple more important than the restored temple. That the messianic age seems to be on earth is seen in such texts as 2 Bar. 40:2, where God’s people are found “in the place that I have chosen,” and 71:1, where the holy land will have mercy on its inhabitants during the eschatological battle. See Harrington 2003a: 667–72.

86 Wardle 2010: 91–92. Nir 2003: 43–77 argues that the hiding of the sacred vessels is evidence of Christian provenance for 2 Baruch, suggesting that they will be used again in the rebuilt temple at the return of Christ. But the NT nowhere anticipates a rebuilt earthly temple after the return of Christ.

people. This is also apparent in chapters 7–8. In 7:1 the destroying angel breaks down the walls so that the enemies of God's people cannot claim credit for burning down “the place” (כִּי־הָיָה) of the mighty God. Following this, a voice is heard from within “the temple” (הַמִּקְדָּשׁ),⁸⁷ inviting the invading armies to enter, since “he who preserved the ‘house’ (בֵּית) has abandoned it” (8:1–2).⁸⁹ The earthly temple is an empty shell when devoid of the presence of God. In this part of 2 Baruch, there is no hope of a new temple.

Section 3 (2 Bar. 10:1–12:5)

This section is a lament over the loss of the temple, again reflecting Baruch's understanding of its cosmic nature as in 3:4–9. The earth need no longer produce crops, vines or grapes, since these will no longer be required for temple offerings. Normal seasonal rhythms will cease, people will no longer marry and have children for “this mother is desolate,” and no longer will beauty be the topic of conversation. Had the temple still stood, all of life would have had significance, but with its fall, everything else falls.

The priests are to hurl the keys to heaven so that God would guard the house himself, for they have been false stewards. The implication is that the sin of 2 Bar 1:2–3 is now attributed to the priesthood and the heavenly temple has taken the place of the earthly.

Section 5.1 (2 Bar 31–43)

Here, Baruch assembles the elders of the people in the Kidron valley to instruct them. Temple symbolism appears in 31:1–32:6 and 44:5–7, surrounding a vision of a forest and a vine (36–42), interpreted with reference to the ultimate destruction of Daniel's fourth kingdom, whose end will come at the hands of the Messiah on Mount Zion (39–40). The vision comes to Baruch at the desolate site of the former temple, showing the ongoing significance of that site.⁹⁰ He “enters” the holy of holies to enquire of God. As he sits there in the holy place and weeps, God reveals the eschatological scenario just described.

87 This word only appears here, in 10:5 where Baruch sits in front of the destroyed temple, and in 80:3, where the destruction of the temple is described.

88 This word appears here and in 8:4; 10:18; 80:3 to refer to the temple, and twice in 22:8 to refer to an ordinary dwelling.

89 Nir 2003: 80–81 relates the abandonment of the temple by God to the tearing of the temple veil in Matt 27:50; Mark 15:38 with the implication (as in T. Benj. 9:3–4) that God was leaving the temple and going to the nations. Such ideas are absent from 2 Baruch.

90 Fuller Dow 2010: 123–24. Cf. 2 Bar. 10:4.

The temple is the place of revelation, and the place where the priests of old offered holy sacrifices and fragrant incense (34–35).

In 31:4 Baruch admonishes the elders of the people not to forget Zion and to remember the anguish of Jerusalem. Murphy may be right when he suggests that Baruch is here picking up a slogan repeated by the people. Baruch agrees in principle, but provides an appropriate explanation (2 Bar 32).⁹¹ Just as Jerusalem has been destroyed, everything will be destroyed (31:5) so that the new era can be inaugurated (32). This is accompanied by the shaking of the creation (32:1) as a precursor to the renewal of the creation (32:6), an allusion to Hag 2:6, setting the destruction of Jerusalem in its cosmic context. The author of Hebrews uses Hag 2:6 similarly in Heb 12:25–29 to explain the removal of what is displeasing to God and the inauguration of the unshakeable kingdom.⁹²

The destruction of Solomon's temple and its rebuilding (32:2), followed by the destruction of the second temple (32:3),⁹³ and the building of the eschatological temple, "renewed in glory and perfected forever" (ἡ δὲ οὐρανόθεν ἰερόσυλον ἱερὸν ἡν ἡμεῖς ἰδοῦμεν)⁹⁴ are detailed in 2 Bar. 32:2–5. The text reflects the history of the temple site, with the successive construction and destruction of the two temples known to the author, but anticipates not the imminent rebuilding of the recently destroyed second temple, but the eschatological temple.⁹⁵

Section 6.2 (2 Bar 53:1–77:26)

This section contains Baruch's dream vision of a cloud coming out of the sea containing black and bright waters (53), the interpretation of the vision by the angel Ramail (55:3–74:4), and the conclusion to the apocalypse. The vision is a history of the world from the creation to the consummation (56:2), alternating with events that were good (bright waters) and bad (black waters).⁹⁶ The detailed review of history comes to an end with the post-exilic rebuilding of

91 Murphy 1985b: 104.

92 Laansma 2008b: 12–15. In Hebrews the allusion to Haggai follows immediately after a contrast between the terrors associated with Sinai and the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem (12:18–24). I discuss the allusion to Hag 2:6 in Heb 12:25–29 in chapter 7 (below).

93 This is anticipated in the fictional setting of the narrative, but had taken place in reality.

94 See Bogaert 1969: 2: 67–68. Charles 1913e: 499 considers that these verses are an interpolation interrupting the flow of the chapter, but the allusion to Hag 2:6 in 32:1 indicates that Baruch is thinking of the cosmic implications of the destruction of the temple and the construction of the eschatological temple.

95 Collins 1998: 215.

96 See Lied 2008: 92–95 for the implications of the white and black waters creating and de-creating covenantal space respectively.

the temple (the twelfth waters). The Maccabean wars are ignored, as are the details of the fall of the second temple.⁹⁷

The fourth bright waters refer to the time of the Exodus and the Sinai revelation when the heavens were shaken (59:3). This was when God revealed numerous things to Moses, the foremost of which was the “‘blueprint’ (כְּתוּבָה) of Zion and its measurements” in the “pattern” (כְּתוּבָה) of which “the present sanctuary” (מִקְדָּשׁ הַזֶּה, 59:4) was made. The issue here is the referent of the terms “Zion” and “present sanctuary.” Gurtner’s choice of “blueprint” for the word כְּתוּבָה when it refers to Zion in 59:4 is confusing.⁹⁸ “Shape,” “image” or “form” would have been better.⁹⁹ In 4:5 the “pattern” of the tabernacle that God showed to Moses was probably the “city engraved on the palm of God’s hands,” that is, the heavenly city and temple (4:3). The same idea seems to be present in this text. God showed Moses the “shape” or “image” or “form” of the heavenly city (here Zion), which Moses was to use as the pattern of the “present sanctuary.” In the context of 59:4, the “present sanctuary” is either the wilderness tabernacle or the first or second temple. While none of these can really be described as “present,” the second temple is surely “present” in the narrative of 2 Baruch. Charles communicates the sense well, when he translates “the sanctuary of the present time,”¹⁰⁰ that is, the earthly sanctuary in its various

97 Grabbe and Charlesworth 1981: 65 suggest that this vision and its interpretation may be a much earlier text put to use by the author. They note an exception to the general rule that historical reviews were meant to show readers that they were living in the end-time.

98 This word appears twice in this verse, and Gurtner translates “the blueprint (כְּתוּבָה) of Zion . . . in the pattern (כְּתוּבָה) of which the present sanctuary was made.” The word also appears in 4:5, where God showed Moses the pattern of the tabernacle (כְּתוּבָה כְּתוּבָה). See Gurtner 2009: 33, 102.

99 The text may be read as a subjective genitive (the image that is Zion). For “shape,” “form” or “image” for כְּתוּבָה see Brockelmann 1895: 74; Gurtner 2009: 160.

100 Charles 1913e: 513 (see note 4). For this reading the word כְּתוּבָה (“in the likeness”) needs to be emended to כְּתוּבָהּ (“and the likeness”), an emendation adopted by Bogaert 1969: 2: 111–12; Dederich 1973: 34; and Gurtner 2009: 102. Klijn 1983a: 642 declines to emend the text and reads, “he showed him . . . the likeness of Zion with its measurements which was to be made after the likeness of the present sanctuary.” If the un-emended text were original (which seems unlikely) it gives an interesting perspective, suggesting that Zion would be made in the likeness of the wilderness sanctuary, with the implication that the eschatological sanctuary in which God will ultimately dwell with his people will resemble that sanctuary. Gäbel 2006: 103, working from Klijn 1983a: 642 suggests that God revealed to Moses that Solomon’s temple was to be built after the pattern of the wilderness tabernacle. This reading seems out of the question, and is irrelevant to Exod 25:8–9, 40, which is surely in view here.

manifestations, designed according to the pattern shown to Moses on Sinai (Exod 25:8–9, 40).

Moses sees more than just the shape of the heavenly temple. He also sees the greatness of paradise, the completion of the ages and the beginning of the day of judgement, the number of offerings not yet offered, and the worlds that have not yet come. He also sees innumerable angels and flaming hosts, and the orders of the heads of angels. The text is based on Deut 34:1–4, but Moses sees not just Canaan, but the entire cosmos, including the heavenly city and temple. Just as in 4:1–7, the “real” Jerusalem is in heaven, so here the real land promised to the ancestors is in heaven, with the text negating earthly realities and transferring them to heaven.¹⁰¹ Expectations are shifted from earth to heaven,¹⁰² and “the promises God made to Moses regarding the land will therefore . . . be fulfilled (sic) in the other world.”¹⁰³

The sixth bright waters are the time of David and Solomon, including “the building of Zion” (בנין ציון) and the dedication of “the sanctuary” (המקדש)¹⁰⁴ with the offering of many offerings (61:2). There was peace and tranquillity, and Zion enjoyed sovereignty over lands and regions. These conditions reflect such texts as 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 2 Kings 5:4, where God gives his people rest from their enemies and the temple is built.¹⁰⁵ Given the nature of the temple as a microcosm of the universe seen in the devastating effects of its destruction (3:1–9), the temple in this text can be seen as the completion of the creation.¹⁰⁶

The ninth black waters were the time of Manasseh, who acted so wickedly that “it [the wickedness of Manasseh] removed the glory of the Most High from the Sanctuary” (64:6). The primary reference is Ezek 10:8–19, which is to be dated at the time of the exile, but Baruch brings it forward to the time of Manasseh (2 Chr 33:1–10), ignoring Manasseh’s repentance and restoration (2 Chr 33:10–17), and leaving the temple an empty shell.¹⁰⁷ The eleventh black

101 Lied 2008: 278.

102 Murphy 1985b: 86–87.

103 Lied 2008: 297.

104 2 Baruch consistently uses the expression המקדש for the sanctuary (10:18; 34:1; 59:4; 61:2; 64:2, 6). It could be translated “holy house” or “holy place.” (Lied, *ibid.*, p. 65).

105 See also Deut 12:10; 25:19; Josh 21:44; 23:1; 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 2 Chr 6:41–42.

106 Lied 2008: 68–70.

107 The departure of the Lord from the temple is reported in 2 Bar. 8:2 when the angel permits the enemies to destroy it. However, there is no reference to the glory returning to the temple after Manasseh. While 2 Bar. 66 recounts Josiah’s reform, the implication is that it was a superficial reform, since the glory of YHWH was no longer present in the temple. Lied (*ibid.*: 76, 90, note 50) suggests the continuing presence of the Lord in the temple

waters represent the exile, with the destruction of Zion and the temple, “the disaster that has now befallen Zion,” although the king of Babylon who did this will ultimately fall (67:7). This is followed by the twelfth bright waters, the rebuilding of the temple.

In the literary setting of 2 Baruch the rebuilding of the temple is in the future: “Zion will again be built” (ܐܘܪܝܢ ܕܒܝܢܐ, 68:5), its offerings restored, the priests return to their ministry, and the gentiles come to honour it, “but not as fully as before” (ܕܠܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, 68:6). This reflects dissatisfaction with the second temple and the reality that the second temple was not as glorious as the first.¹⁰⁸

The remainder of this part of 2 Baruch details an eschatological battle (70), followed by the messianic age (71–74), when the Messiah has sat down in eternal peace on the throne of his kingdom. Joy will be revealed and rest will appear (73:1). While the text reflects the restoration of the pristine conditions of Eden, including the end of pain in childbirth (73:7),¹⁰⁹ the appearance of rest echoes again the conditions associated with the building of the temple under David and Solomon. The cosmic deconstruction associated with the destruction of the temple is now undone with the advent of the messianic age with the Messiah enthroned. However, the text is silent about Zion and the temple. While these have disappeared from view, the restoration of creation in terms of the return to the conditions of Eden suggests that the entire creation has become a temple. No longer are the joy and rest restricted to Zion, but gladness will spread throughout all the earth (73:2). That which is incorruptible has replaced that which is corruptible as history comes to its intended *telos*. But, given the place of the righteous dead, in Paradise in the heights of heaven in 2 Bar. 51, and the “paradisiacal” description of the restored conditions of Eden in these chapters that appear to be on earth, it seems that in 2 Baruch, as in some NT texts, heaven as God’s space and earth as human space are merged into one in the eschaton.¹¹⁰

from the time of David to the destruction, apart from during the time of Manasseh. On this see Tg. Jon. Isa 66:1 (Chilton 1987: 126, note 66:1); b. San 103b.

108 Ezra 3:12; 1 En. 89:73–74.

109 Lied 2008: 219–20. Sayler 1984: 71 refers to “the generating of children as part of the curses brought about by Adam’s sin” and for this reason finds the restoration in this text partial for that reason. But surely it is pain (ܥܒܕܐ) in childbirth that is the curse rather than child-bearing itself, as Sayler (tentatively) suggests as part of the solution to her quandary.

110 Rev 21:1–4, 9–22:7. Nickelsburg 2005: 283 notes that it is unclear how the future reversal takes place and how the pictures of heaven in 2 Bar. 51 and the earthly, eschatological paradise in 2 Bar. 73–74 can be reconciled. To be sure, 2 Baruch never explicitly mentions a merger of heaven and earth. Murphy 1985b: 88–89 negates any earthly eschatological

Conclusion

In most of 2 Baruch there is a consistent picture: the temple has cosmic features, so that its destruction means the reversal of creation and its reconstruction the renewal of creation. This contrasts with the picture in the opening section where Baruch expresses his dismay at the destruction of city and the temple. There, God assures him that the city and temple he sees are not the real ones that pre-existed the visible ones and were revealed to Adam, Abraham and Moses. Thus, Baruch uses the notion of a heavenly temple to make a negative point about the earthly temple.¹¹¹ Two oblique references to the rebuilding of the (second) temple appear in 6:9; 32:3, but this notion fades from view, as attention shifts to the heavenly city/temple/palace as the place of the righteous dead (51). At the end of the vision of black and bright waters there is a picture of the restoration of Eden, which appears to be on earth. In this eschatological temple the utensils from Solomon's temple will be used, indicating the restoration of the sacrificial cult.

The Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch

Greek-Slavonic Baruch (3 Baruch) is an apocalyptic text responding to the destruction of the Second Temple, also under the guise of the destruction of Solomon's temple.¹¹² It is extant in two traditions, a Greek tradition (G) represented by two fifteenth-sixteenth century manuscripts and a Slavonic tradition (S), represented by some twelve manuscripts, some of which predate the

hope in 2 Baruch, suggesting that Baruch "anticipates the passing away of everything earthly." This seems to be an inadequate reading of what appears as an (implicit) earthly eschatology, and he does not treat 2 Bar. 73–74 in his chapter on Zion. Hobbins 1998: 56 refers to "the *repristination* of the point of intersection of the temporal and eternal spheres."

111 Murphy 1985b: 88. Murphy suggests that only here and in Heb [8:5] does an author use the heavenly idea to make a negative point about the Jewish cult or the earthly temple; however, this is not correct, as I show above in connection with T. Levi and 1 Enoch where dissatisfaction with the earthly cult and priesthood led to the transfer of holiness to the heavenly temple. See Suter 1979a: 115–35; Nickelsburg 1981a: 575–600; Himmelfarb 1993: 12–13. Similar ideas permeate the Qumran texts, where dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple and cultus is keenly felt and manifests itself in talk of a heavenly temple. I will argue below that Heb 8:5 does not negate the wilderness tabernacle as is so often maintained.

112 Harlow 2001: 420 attributes this view to "[m]ost interpreters." See also Wright 2000b: 164–65. For a recent discussion on the state of scholarship on 3 Baruch see Hilton 2013: 247–68.

Greek manuscripts.¹¹³ It was probably originally composed in Greek, with the extant Greek manuscripts apparently copied from an earlier Greek *Vorlage*, now lost.¹¹⁴ The Slavonic manuscripts seem also to have been copied from a “single, very literal Slavic translation of a single Greek manuscript.”¹¹⁵ It was probably a Jewish work,¹¹⁶ although both traditions have distinctively Christian elements that are independent of one another,¹¹⁷ leading to the conclusion that both traditions have been “Christianized” by those who valued this work and preserved it.¹¹⁸ It clearly post-dates the fall of Jerusalem since that is lamented in the prologue, but any time in the first two centuries CE seems possible for

113 For a discussion of the MS evidence see Kulik 2010: 7–8, 19–27, and the earlier discussion of Gaylord 1983b: 653–55. For a comparison of the similarities of the Greek and Slavonic traditions see Carlsson 2004: 277–78.

114 Gaylord 1983b: 653.

115 Harlow 2001: 421, Harlow cites as a critical edition of the Slavonic text, Gaylord’s Hebrew University PhD thesis, Gaylord 1983a, which has not been published. Gaylord 1983b: 653 (note 3) states that this publication is “forthcoming,” although it was not published prior to his decease in 2006. The critical edition of the Greek text is from Picard 1967: 81–96. In what follows Greek citations are taken from Picard’s edition, as found in Penner and Miller 2006. Unless otherwise noted, English translations of the Greek text are my own, and of the Slavonic text are from Kulik 2010. The letters “S” and “G” adjacent to chapter and verse references indicate the Slavonic and Greek traditions respectively. Where the letters are absent, both traditions are substantially the same.

116 Collins 2000a: 255; Harlow 1996: 108; 2001: 424–31. Harlow (1996: 87; 2001: 428) notes, that “[v]irtually nowhere in early Christianity—Jewish Christianity included—is the destruction of Jerusalem an occasion for lamentation” (see Harlow’s fuller discussion in 1996: 94–108). James 1897: lxxii assumed that it was a Christian work, as also Himmelfarb 1993: 87 (see now her full discussion in 2016: 41–62). Here, Himmelfarb (p. 50) finds it “extraordinary” that a Jewish work attributes no importance to the loss of the temple. On the other hand, it seems extraordinary to imagine a Christian work attributing human rewards and punishment to the ministry of an angelic mediator carrying baskets of flowers representing their merits to God in heaven, without any reference to the work of Christ (although the role of Michael in Apoc. Paul has some similarities with that in 3 Bar—for the differences between these two texts see Harlow 1996: 35–36, 152–53). Gaylord 1983b: 656–57 thinks that, at the time 3 Baruch was written, Christian and Jewish responses to the destruction of Jerusalem could have been similar, although Harlow’s discussion (1996: 94–108) would not support this. Nickelsburg 1981b: 299–303 includes a useful, if brief, discussion of 3 Baruch but it is entirely absent from his 2005 Second Edition, with no discussion of the reason for its absence. Himmelfarb 2016: 47 concludes that “Nickelsburg has decided that 3 Baruch does not belong in a book devoted to Jewish literature.”

117 Harlow 2001: 424–26. The Slavonic tradition has less that is overtly Christian, see Lee 2001: 158.

118 Harlow 2001: 432–44. See also the discussion in Jones 2011: 117–20.

the actual date of composition.¹¹⁹ Kulik thinks Palestine is a viable option for the provenance,¹²⁰ although other scholars find insufficient evidence to make a call on this.¹²¹

The prologue, which takes the form of a dialogue between Baruch and God, rejects Jerusalem, and by implication the temple.¹²² Baruch is weeping over the destruction of the city and, in the Greek tradition, over the taunts of the nations to whom they had been delivered, saying, “Where is their God?” (Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν, 1:2G).¹²³ This question is not immediately answered, rather an angel appears and commands Baruch not to “be so concerned for the salvation (restoration) of Jerusalem” (μὴ τοσοῦτόν σε μέλη περι τῆς σωτηρίας Ἱερουσαλήμ, 1:3G), and announces that he has come to reveal to Baruch “all the things of God” (πάντα <τὰ> τοῦ θεοῦ, 1:4G).¹²⁴ The “things of God” is apparently a reference to Baruch’s heavenly journey that begins in chapter 2, where he will find the answer to the taunts of the nations,¹²⁵ and where he will see why there is no need to mourn the loss of the temple. Baruch then “becomes silent” (ἡσυχάζω, 1:6G), indicating that the conflict in his mind is resolved.¹²⁶ Significantly, this conflict is not so much about the destruction of Jerusalem as its restoration (see 1:3G). As Harlow points out “it is just such hopes [for the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple] that constitute the specific rhetorical exigence the work is designed to address.”¹²⁷ And it is these hopes that the text

119 See the discussion in Gaylord 1983b: 655–56. There is a possible allusion in Origen, *Princ.* 2.3.6 (see Cox 1997: 527). Wright 2000a: 150 leans toward a date “long after the destruction of Jerusalem,” while Jones 2011: 120 leans toward an earlier date, as do Himmelfarb 1993: 87 (“shortly after 70 CE”), and Collins 2000a: 256.

120 Kulik 2010: 13–15.

121 Jones 2011: 120. Himmelfarb 1993: 87; Collins 2000a: 256 and Daschke 2010: 174 place it in Egypt.

122 Harlow 2001: 427.

123 This question, or similar, found on the lips of the nations, appears in Ps 42:10; 79:10; 115:2; Joel 2:7; Mic 7:10. See Picard 1970: 78 (note 2); Nickelsburg 1981b: 302, 307 (note 50). On p. 302 Nickelsburg also notes Deut 32:37, where the same question comes from YHWH, ironically asking the defeated nations. He notes other echoes of Deut 32 in 3 Bar 16:2–4 and suggests that “the author answers Baruch’s question by interpreting the destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the people as punishment for their sins.” On this see also Dean-Otting 1984: 151–52.

124 The Slavonic tradition reads “all the mysteries of God.” The Greek tradition refers to “mysteries” (μυστήρια) in 1:6, 8. The Slavonic tradition may have conflated vv. 4 and 8, see Gaylord 1983b: 663, note g.

125 Dean-Otting 1984: 99; Jones 2011: 111–13.

126 Daschke 2010: 181–82.

127 Harlow 1996: 89.

dismisses with the call for Baruch to “cease provoking God” (Παῦσον τὸν θεὸν παροξύνειν, 1:6G), which he does, with an oath calling on God to judge him if he speaks again (1:7). Jerusalem and the temple are decisively rejected.¹²⁸

Led along by an *angelus interpres*, Baruch traverses five heavens.¹²⁹ At significant points in the narrative Baruch is promised that he will “see the glory of God” (καὶ ὄψει δόξαν θεοῦ),¹³⁰ a comment that draws the reader forward in the narrative. But surprisingly, there is no vision of God in response to the taunts of the nations. The answer, then, is that God is concealed from view in the highest heaven, from “whence he continues to direct the course of human events.”¹³¹ Gaylord detects another underlying question that 3 Baruch answers, that is, “[h]ow can the proper relation between God and men be maintained without the sacrifices of the Temple?”¹³² The response to this question is that the heavenly cultus is a substitute for the temple cultus, and consequently, for 3 Baruch, the Jerusalem temple is obsolete, and never needs to be restored.¹³³ Nevertheless, this heavenly temple cultus is hidden from view, for just as with

128 Harlow (ibid.: 90) suggests it is not so much Jerusalem and the temple that are renounced, but rather unrealistic hopes for restoration. On this see Picard 1970: 92.

129 Stone 1984: 411; Bauckham 1990a: 372–74; and Himmelfarb 1993: 90–91 argue that there were originally seven heavens in 3 Baruch and the text has somehow been truncated. Origen *Princ.* 2.3.6 claims that Baruch depicts seven heavens, although Harlow 1996: 39; Collins 2000a: 256; Wright 2000b: 165; and Daschke 2010: 183 (note 92) doubt that Origen is referring to what we now know as 3 Baruch. Himmelfarb 1993: 90 argues that if it has been truncated, “it is dangerous to argue about the message of a work that is missing so crucial an element as its conclusion.” On the other hand, Harlow 1996: 34–76 argues strongly for the integrity of the text as it stands, maintaining that the five heaven schema and Baruch’s aborted attempt to see God in heaven is intrinsic to the literary and theological aims of the text. See also Wright 2000a: 149; Daschke 2010: 183 (note 92) and Morgan 2013: 184–200, who writes on the assumption that the text as it stands is complete. This reading seems preferable to those that propose that the text has been truncated.

130 See 4:2S; 7:2; 11:2; 16:4S.

131 Jones 2011: 112. See also Kulik 2010: 108, citing Nickelsburg 1981b: 302; Dean-Otting 1984: 151–52, 155–57. Cf. also Harlow 1996: 75 “[God] continues to exercise sovereignty over cosmic and earthly affairs. He still rewards the righteous and punishes the wicked, so Jews should set about the business of living good lives.” Morgan 2013: 186–87, 198–200 argues that to see the glory of God is to “witness God’s sovereign and saving interaction with humanity.”

132 Gaylord 1983b: 659; Himmelfarb 1993: 93; Lee 2001: 159.

133 Himmelfarb 1993: 34; Harlow 1996: 71–75; Lee 2001: 159.

the builders of the tower in 3 Baruch 2–3 who were excluded from heaven, it is impossible for humans to cross over from earth to heaven.¹³⁴

In the first three heavens Baruch sees those who built the tower of Babel (2:7), those who planned the tower of Babel and forced others to make bricks for the tower (3:5–6),¹³⁵ the tree by which Adam and Eve were deceived, identified as a vine planted by Satanael (4:7–8). This vine then turns out to be the vine planted and tended by Noah (4:12–15) at the Lord's command (4:15), with the warning, "Beware, Baruch: the tree still possesses its evil" (4:16S).¹³⁶ A variety of other cosmological phenomena are then described.¹³⁷

In the fourth heaven,¹³⁸ Baruch sees plain (πεδίον) and a lake with a multitude of birds unlike those on earth.¹³⁹ Baruch learns from his guide that the plain with the lake is where "the souls of the righteous" (αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν δικαίων, 2:5G) come, and that the birds are those "who continually sing hymns to the Lord" (ἃ διαπαντὸς ἀνυμνοῦσι τὸν κύριον, 2:7G, cf. 2:5S).¹⁴⁰ The ceaseless praise to

134 Cf. Morgan 2013: 193, "while the earthly Temple is gone and the heavenly temple, if it exists, is out of reach, God is still sovereign and his people will continue to live under his care . . . If the glory of God is to be seen, the experience will be *outside* the Temple." This is at variance from the experience of the Israelites when the glory of God filled the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–38) and the temple (2 Chr 5:14), and of Isaiah (Isa 6:13) who, from his vantage point in the temple saw the whole earth filled with the glory of God. For 3 Baruch these days are in the past.

135 Harlow 1996: 58–60 discusses the tower in connection with Baruch's failure to reach the highest heaven. The tower builders also represent an aborted attempt to reach God.

136 Kulik 2010: 188. This warning is absent from the Greek tradition, which contains a Christian interpolation explaining that the vine's bitterness will be changed into sweetness through Jesus Christ enabling human entrance to Paradise. Both traditions contain a warning against the evils of strong drink, with a list of vices in the Slavonic tradition that seems to reflect Matt 15:19 and other texts. The appearance of similar lists elsewhere indicates that dependence on Matt 15:19 is not certain. See *ibid.*: 220–23.

137 It would be a diversion to deal with the detail of these, although I do note, with Himmelfarb 1993: 93, 144 (notes 70–71), that the stories of the fall of Adam and Eve and Noah, and the tower of Babel locate the origin of evil with humanity, thereby rejecting the Enoch traditions that locate it with the fallen watchers. See also Bauckham 1990a: 372 and Orlov 2003a: 200.

138 Both the Greek and Slavonic traditions read the "third heaven" here, although 4:2 implies the entrance to the third heaven, and the entrance to the fifth heaven appears in 11:1, making this the fourth heaven. See Wright 2000b: 170; Kulik 2010: 285–86, 307–8.

139 For heaven as a plain see 1QH^a XI 21. The Slavonic tradition has a mountain. Kulik (pp. 288–92) discusses the lake as a place of purification.

140 In the Greek tradition it is unclear whether those who sing are the souls of the righteous or the birds, while Slavonic tradition nowhere identifies the birds with the righteous dead. Kulik 2010: 295 suggests that the Slavonic tradition may preserve an older tradition where

God is reminiscent of those who praise God day and night in the temple. Thus the plain and the lake bear some resemblance to the outer courts of the temple where the praises of God are sung.¹⁴¹

The journey reaches its climax at the gate of the fifth heaven (11:1–2). Baruch wishes to enter, but is forbidden to do so “until Michael the one with custody of the keys of the kingdom of heaven comes” (ἕως ἔλθῃ Μιχαήλ ὁ κλειδοῦχος τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, 11:2G). Baruch seems to be excluded from the fifth heaven.¹⁴² Instead, he stands at the gate with his angelic guide and observes Michael coming and going, until (in the Greek tradition) the door closes and he and the angel withdraw (ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνεχώρησαμεν, 17:1G) and he returns to earth.

Standing at the door, Baruch sees Michael coming and going with “an enormous bowl” (φιάλη μεγάλη σφόδρα, 11:8G) in which are placed flowers brought in smaller baskets by angels, representing the good deeds, prayers and virtues of humans (12:1–5).¹⁴³ These flowers Michael takes to God in the supercelestial heaven (14:2), returning soon afterwards with “oil” (ἔλαιον, 15:1G), or “full of mercy” (15:1S).¹⁴⁴ The oil (mercy) is a reward for those who have been diligent in their good deeds (15:2S), or answers to the requests of those who pray (15:2G). The word used for “bowl” (φιάλη) refers to the bowls used in the

the birds are angelic beings praising God. For this notion see 1 En. 40; 2 En. 8:8; 21; Apoc. Abr. 18; T. Levi 3:8; Apoc. Zeph. 8; Asc. Isa. 7:13, 20, 29, 36; 8:17–20; 9:27–32; the Qumran Sabbath Songs (*passim*), and Heb 12:22.

141 Lee 2001: 160.

142 Wright 2000b: 172–73; Carlsson 2004: 341–42; Kulik 2010: 309; Morgan 2013: 185. Harlow 1996: 36, 146–47 argues that Baruch does enter the fifth heaven, and that while this is not explicitly stated is “implied.” Both Gaylord 1983b and Kulik 2010: 305 translate συναντάω in 11:6 with “went to meet him” (cf. Harlow 1996: 36) but motion towards seems not to be intrinsic to the verb (see *LSJ* 1696; *BDAG* 965). And moreover, the verbs in 11:6 are all in the singular. It is the angelic guide who meets and bows down to Michael, not Baruch. Note also, it is after the door is closed that Baruch and the angel withdraw (ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνεχώρησαμεν, 17:1g). On this Harlow (*ibid.*: 36) posits a second door through which Michael goes to the inner heavens. This seems unnecessary.

143 See 11:5, 9; 12:5; 15:2. The Greek tradition restricts these offerings to prayers. See Himmelfarb 1993: 128.

144 See the discussion in Kulik 2010: 366–67 who notes that the Slavonic text could be translated “full mercies” or “full of mercy” with the receptacle that was filled with mercy unstated. He notes the similarity between the Greek words ἔλαιον (“oil”) and ἔλεος (“mercy”), suggesting a play on these two words, or, with Gaylord 1983b: 678, that the Slavonic translator may have confused the two words.

tabernacle for sprinkling liquids on the altar (Exod 27:3; 38:3). Thus, the prayers are seen to be a form of offering.¹⁴⁵

Two other classes of people appear in 12:6–13:5. In 12:6–7 it seems that the prayers and good deeds of some were insufficient. These were also placed in Michael's basket and taken to God. The reward for these people was in the measure in which they gave, with an encouragement to be more diligent, and "to prostrate themselves in prayer in the holy Temple" (15:3S).¹⁴⁶ Some angels had empty baskets from "evil men" (12:1G) or "evil places and men" (12:1S). God's response to these is punishment and curses (16:3–4G; 16:3–7S).

If the fourth heaven symbolises the outer courts of the temple with its ceaseless praise, then the fifth heaven would symbolise the next level of holiness, accessible to the priests, from which the non-priest Baruch is excluded. Michael comes and goes from this fifth heaven to the highest heaven with the prayers and good deeds of the humans, which he offers to God in the celestial holy of holies, somewhat like the high priest on the Day of Atonement.¹⁴⁷ Thus, Kulik argues, this procedure has "much in common with the terrestrial Day of Atonement."¹⁴⁸ Building on this suggestion he notes that the "loss of this rite created one of the most painful liturgical gaps after the destruction of the Temple."¹⁴⁹ Thus, while the Day of Atonement ritual was no longer possible,

¹⁴⁵ Wright 2000b: 172.

¹⁴⁶ This is Kulik's translation, and the reference to the "holy Temple" is problematic, since the temple is clearly destroyed. Kulik uses the word "Temple" in his translation of the Slavonic in 13:4; 15:3; 16:4. The Greek word in 13:4 and 16:4 is ἐκκλησία, which Kulik translates with "assembly" in 13:4 and "assemblies" in 16:4. The Greek of 15:3 has no reference to a place of worship. In each case Gaylord translates the Slavonic and the Greek with "church/es." Kulik 2010: 335 doubts the authenticity of all three passages, although he notes a similar topic and terminology in both traditions, suggesting that it was "somehow represented in the common proto-text of G and S." In his further discussion (pp. 336–38) he discusses whether the passages in question are Christian interpolations as is often suggested. He notes that the Slavonic word he has translated "Temple" has a wide semantic range and "may mean not only 'church' or 'assembly, community' but also 'temple.'" He defends his translation "Temple" with the suggestion that "16:4S might have referred to the past and be mentioned among the reasons for the destruction of the Temple" (p. 338). Harlow 1996: 84–86, 187–88; 2001: 438 includes these texts among the distinctively Christian elements in 3 Baruch.

¹⁴⁷ The text is unclear as to whether or not God resides in a heaven higher than the fifth. Wright 2000b: 172–73 concludes that God resides in the inner parts of the fifth heaven as does Carlsson 2004: 342–43, while Harlow 1996: 50 proposes seven heavens as the most likely number. See the comprehensive discussion in Kulik 2010: 306–29.

¹⁴⁸ Kulik 2010: 361–65. See also Dean-Otting 1984: 152; Wright 2000b: 173.

¹⁴⁹ Kulik 2010: 361. See e.g. b. Ber 32b.

there was a heavenly counterpart where Michael entered the celestial holy of holies and achieved atonement for the righteous.¹⁵⁰

Harlow reaches a somewhat similar conclusion, although without reference to the Day of Atonement. What formerly took place in the temple is unnecessary “since the appropriate sacrifices of all humanity—prayers and good deeds—are offered to God on a daily basis through the agency of angels.”¹⁵¹ Similarly, Daschke suggests that sacrifice, and therefore the temple, are no longer necessary, since the “prayers and virtues of humanity are delivered to God via angels, not cultic sacrifice.”¹⁵² A third option is suggested by Lee, who proposes that according to 3 Baruch, prayer takes the place of the temple, “God’s people do not necessarily have to long for the destroyed Temple because they can meet God, wherever and whenever they pray.”¹⁵³

Whichever of these proposals are adopted, and all have their merits and their difficulties,¹⁵⁴ 3 Baruch holds out no hope of a new temple in the eschaton.¹⁵⁵ Rather, the text sees the temple service continuing in the celestial temple, where God is enthroned directing the world and dispensing rewards and punishments to humanity.¹⁵⁶ For this reason, Baruch need no longer irritate God with his sorrow at its loss. It is no longer necessary.

The Apocalypse of Abraham

The Apocalypse of Abraham (Apoc. Ab.) is extant only in an Old Church Slavonic translation extant in six manuscripts dating from the fourteenth to

150 Lee 2001: 164 reaches a similar conclusion, although without specific reference to the Day of Atonement.

151 Harlow 1996: 156.

152 Daschke 2010: 185. See also Harlow 1996: 73–75.

153 Lee 2001: 163.

154 It seems to me that Kulik’s connection with the Day of Atonement is rather too specific. While that God is hidden from human view to all but Michael is suggestive, other features of the Day of Atonement are absent. Lee’s suggestion that God can be encountered in prayer at any time and place, is not quite specific enough, since the agency of Michael is required and individual access to the presence of God is barred. This is quite different from Heb 4:14–16, where people are able to approach “the throne of grace” in prayer. On this text see chapter 8 (below).

155 Daschke 2010: 185.

156 Jones 2011: 127.

the seventeenth centuries.¹⁵⁷ Chapters 1–8 tell the story of Abraham's life in Ur working for his father, an idol maker. Abraham realises the futility of idol worship and, as he reflects on this, God calls him to leave his father's house. No sooner than he does, fire descends from heaven and destroys the house.¹⁵⁸ Chapters 9–32 are an apocalypse set in the context of God's covenant with Abraham related in Gen 15. In Apoc. Ab. the sacrifice takes place at Horeb, where the angel Yahoel appears and escorts Abraham on a heavenly journey, in which he sees the throne of God. From there God reveals to him the course of world history from Eden to the destruction of the temple (27:1–12) and its restoration at the end of the age. In the final chapters, God promises to restore the sovereignty of his people. The work ends with Abraham accepting the words of God in his heart (32:6).

Since the work recounts the destruction of the temple, it post-dates the events of 70 CE, although the precise date is elusive. The earliest external evidence consists of an inconclusive allusion in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones*, dated sometime in the first three centuries CE.¹⁵⁹ For Apoc. Ab., a date late in the first century seems reasonable.¹⁶⁰ The original language was probably Hebrew, although it seems clear that there was an intermediate Greek translation, the *Vorlage* of the Slavonic version.¹⁶¹ Composition in Hebrew probably indicates Palestinian provenance,¹⁶² and the lack of any Christian signature features makes it likely that it is a Jewish work.¹⁶³

157 Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 681–82, 686–88; Kulik 2004: 3, 97 (who lists ten MSS). Rubinkiewicz notes that other “fragments, summaries and reworkings” are derived from these. For the details of each MS see Turdeanu 1972: 153–80.

158 See Orlov 2008a: 36–39. Cf. also Jub. 11:16–12:14; Gen. Rab. 38:13.

159 Mueller 1982: 344–45; Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683; Kulik 2004: 3.

160 Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683; Vermes 1986: 290.

161 Stone 1984: 416; Vermes 1986: 289; Kulik 2004: 37–66, 91. Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683 tentatively suggest that the Slavonic version may have been translated directly from Hebrew.

162 Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683.

163 Vermes 1986: 289. Apoc. Ab. 29:4–13 has traditionally been seen as a Christian interpolation, referring to a man from Abraham's tribe being mocked and beaten, and worshipped by the heathen and by some from Israel. The Christian provenance of this material is, however, disputed, see Licht 1971: 126 and Stone 1984: 415–16. Hall 1988: 107–10 argues that it is a Jewish interpolation, and Kulik 2004: 51–53 reads the pericope in terms of an “anti-messiah” such as Beliar/Belial or Melki-reša'. Pennington 1984: 366 appears to think the entire Apocalypse is a Christian work.

Some scholars have suggested that the two parts of Apoc. Ab. are separate documents joined by an editor and need to be read as such.¹⁶⁴ But, as Stone points out, the story of Abraham's life in Ur "forms a fitting preamble" to the visionary material that follows, which refers back to the story in several places.¹⁶⁵ For example, in 8:6 fire burns Terah, his house and everything in it because of his idolatry, and in 27:1–8 the heathen come and burn the temple and plunder the holy things in it, again because of the idolatry of the people. And indeed, in 9:1–10, God commands Abraham, recently rescued from an idolatrous past, to offer a proper sacrifice in the place God will show him.¹⁶⁶

After Terah's house is destroyed, God commands Abraham to offer the sacrificial animals listed in Gen 15:9–10 as a "pure sacrifice . . . in the place which I shall show you on a high mountain" (9:5, 8).¹⁶⁷ Abraham falls on his face, and while prone on the ground hears "the voice <of the holy one>, saying, 'Go, Yahoel, the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name . . .'" (10:3). Yahoel becomes Abraham's *angelus interpres*, accompanying him until he arrives in the heavenly throne room. Then, after averting tension between the living creatures in the throne room, he disappears from view.

When God commands Abraham to offer these sacrifices, he promises that he will reveal eschatological secrets to Abraham (9:6, 9–10). Consequently, in 12:3 Abraham and Yahoel come to "the glorious God's mountains-Horeb," where Yahoel instructs Abraham to do as God had commanded him. As in Gen 15:10, he bisects all the animals apart from the birds on whose wings he and Yahoel will ascend to heaven. There, God will reveal to Abraham what is in heaven, on the earth and in the sea, in the abyss and in the lower depths, in the garden of Eden, and in its rivers, and in the fullness of the inhabited world. Horeb is the setting off point for Abraham's heavenly journey (15:1–7).¹⁶⁸

164 Ginzberg 1906: 1: 91–92; Mueller 1982: 342; Vermes 1986: 288.

165 Stone 1984: 415; Himmelfarb 1993: 62. See 9:6; 10:12; 19:3; 26:3–5.

166 Both Lee 2001: 169–72, and Orlov 2009a: 830–31 make a strong case for the unity of Apoc. Ab. on these grounds.

167 Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from Apoc. Ab. are from Kulik 2004: 9–36.

168 Dean-Otting 1984: 255 notes that the heavenly journey in Apoc. Ab. is a bridge between the earlier journeys of Enoch and Levi and the later hekhalot texts. Several features of these later texts appear, including the angelic name Yahoel, the voice calling to Abraham and the angelic liturgy that Abraham and Yahoel sing together, which is the impetus for Abraham's entry into the heavenly throne room. Carlsson 2004: 144 notes that the similarity with the hekhalot texts is because God is no longer able to be localised in an earthly temple. Since its destruction he can only be encountered in a heavenly temple by way of a heavenly journey.

This is where Moses ascended and saw the God of Israel (Exod 24:9–18). Abraham will do the same.

Significantly, the place is not Zion, which is odd given the allusions to the *Aqedah* in the story.¹⁶⁹ Abraham responds to the call of God with “Here I am,” and God commands him to sacrifice “in the place I shall show you on a high mountain.” The only word Abraham utters to God in Gen 22 is *הנה אנכי* (“here I am,” 22:1, 11, see Apoc. Ab. 14:1), and in Gen 22 Abraham is to offer Isaac on one of the mountains God will show him (Gen 22:2). In Apoc. Ab. 12:4 Abraham tells Yahoel that he has no sacrifice or altar, and Yahoel responds with an invitation to look behind him (cf. Gen 22:13). These allusions, and the traditional association of Moriah with Zion, would seem to make Zion a natural choice for the start of the journey.¹⁷⁰ That it is Horeb indicates dissatisfaction with Zion.¹⁷¹ The temple, not yet built in the narrative setting of the story, but in fact destroyed because of idolatry, may have been considered too defiled to function as the place where proper sacrifice could be restored.¹⁷²

In Apoc. Ab. 12:10 Yahoel explains what Abraham will see. Then, in 15:1–4, as the smoke ascends Abraham and Yahoel mount the birds and ascend to

169 Begg 1988: 44–45.

170 2 Chr 3:1; Josephus. *Ant.* 1.224–226; 7.333; Tg. Neof. Gen 22:2; Jub. 18:13. See Alexander 1988: 115; Kalimi 1990: 345–62; Waltke and Fredricks 2001: 305–6; Fuller Dow 2010: 42–43, 46, 115.

171 Halperin 1988: 109–10 notes the echoes of the story of Moses at Sinai/Horeb, suggesting that the author is deliberately modelling Abraham's experience on Moses at Sinai, although he does not suggest why he might be doing this. He also notes associations with Deuteronomic theology, as does Orlov 2008b: 61–62. This makes the choice of Horeb all the more remarkable, giving the centralisation of worship at Zion in Deuteronomy. While the sacrifice at the “place I shall show you” (Apoc. Ab. 9:6) echoes Gen 22:2, it is also reminiscent of the regulations concerning the centralisation of worship in Deut 12:13–14.

172 Since the destruction of Terah's house due to his idolatry prefigures the destruction of the temple for the idolatry of the people, the command for Abraham to offer a sacrifice prefigures the resumption of proper sacrifices, and the offering “in the place which I will show you on a high mountain” (9:8) indicates a restored temple (Lee 2001: 172–73). The Jerusalem temple will later be described in superlative terms and as intended by God as the place where God is encountered, indicating that it is not the temple *per se* that is the cause of the dissatisfaction, but idolatry connected with the temple (Harlow 2010: 298). In the same context God's anger at the people's idolatry also features. Unlike Ezra and Baruch, Abraham does not mourn the loss of the temple at any length, although he exclaims that his heart is afflicted when he sees it being overthrown (27:6). Unlike 2 Bar 25:1–5, Zion is never called the holy place. Indeed, the names Zion and Jerusalem never appear in this text.

heaven.¹⁷³ Abraham sees Gehenna (15:5–7) and begins to experience appropriate fearful emotions. Yahoel reassures him and explains that he will soon see the Eternal One (16:3), although he will not look at him. At this point, the fire approaches them and together they recite an angelic liturgy (17:8–21).¹⁷⁴ In chapter 18 they arrive in the seventh heaven.¹⁷⁵ That they ascend with the sacrificial birds in the smoke (15:1–4) and join in the heavenly liturgy indicates that heaven is a temple. While the earthly temple had been destroyed by idolatry, the heavenly temple still existed and could be reached by proper sacrifices.¹⁷⁶ That the ascent begins at the “temple” of Horeb and ends at the temple of heaven indicates that the temple is understood as the link between heaven and earth. Abraham enters the temple at Horeb, offers sacrifices and finds himself in heaven.¹⁷⁷ Thus, “the place I shall show you on a high mountain” (9:8) is a temple, the gateway to the heavenly throne room.

The description of heaven is drawn largely from the early chapters of Ezekiel. There is a fiery throne and fiery living creatures with many eyes and four heads, each with four faces and six wings.¹⁷⁸ In keeping with Ezekiel’s vision, the throne is a chariot with fiery wheels full of eyes and an indescribable

173 The significant role of Azazel plays in Apoc. Ab. is outside the scope of the present study. I do note, however, 13:14 where the heavenly garment formerly belonging to Azazel is now set aside for Abraham, indicating an angelic identity for the latter. This is nowhere developed in the text, aside from Abraham’s kneeling with Yahoel and reciting the liturgy. He is not appointed as a priest and clothed in priestly clothing as others are, though angels are the “priests” of heaven and clothed as such. On the role of Azazel see Orlov 2009a: 836–39.

174 On the liturgy see Weitzman 1994: 21–33. For connections between this hymn and later hekhalot songs see Scholem 1946: 57–61; Dean-Otting 1984: 252–53; Himmelfarb 1993: 61, 64. This hymn is early evidence for what flourished in these later texts.

175 Collins 1998: 228–29; Lee 2001: 175. There is no account of Abraham’s passage through the heavens. He is clearly in the heavenly throne room, standing on the seventh firmament (19:4), and later he looks down and sees other heavens. Strangely, Apoc. Ab. 19:6 refers to an eighth heaven, which does not quite fit the schema. See the discussion in Poirier 2004: 391–408.

176 Himmelfarb 1993: 66; Lee 2001: 175–76.

177 This is preferable to seeing the earthly temple as a copy of the heavenly temple, with “above and below” typology as Lee 2001: 176 proposes. Under that scheme, there is no necessary link between the two.

178 The living creatures in Ezek 1 have four wings, while the seraphim in Isa 6 have six. For a similar combination of elements from Isa 6 and Ezek 1 see Rev 4:6–8. The four living creatures in Hekhalot Zutarti each have four heads with four faces, a total of sixty-four faces. See Schäfer 1992: 62–63; 1981: 148–49 (Section 354). See also Tg. Ezek. 1:6, where the same scheme occurs, including sixty-four wings for each head, giving a total of 256 wings (Levey 1987: 21, note 5).

light. Unlike Ezek 1:26–28, however, there is no human-like creature with “the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord” (Ezek 1:28). Rather, the experience moves from “the visual plane to the aural plane;”¹⁷⁹ Abraham hears the sound of the angelic *qedushah*, like the voice of a single man. Then he hears the voice of God calling out of the midst of the fire (19:1), to which he replies, “Here I am.” God is enthroned, and speaks, but is not visible to Abraham.¹⁸⁰

God invites Abraham to look down from his vantage point in heaven. In the sixth and seventh heavens he sees hosts of incorporeal angels, and in the fifth, the stars (19:1–9). Abraham’s star counting episode (Gen 15:5–6) follows in Apoc. Ab. 20, and in 21 God invites Abraham to look beneath his feet and “contemplate the creation which was previously covered over . . . and the age that has been prepared to follow it.” He sees heaven and the things in it and earth and the things in it, and Eden, and men and women on the right and on the left (21:1–7). He enquires of God and learns that those on the left are the people of the present age prepared for judgement and those on the right God’s people in the future, Abraham’s descendants (22:4–5). In these chapters, the temporal axis is viewed spatially. The present age is described in 21:3–4, and the age to come is depicted by Eden in 21:6–7.¹⁸¹ There, he sees “those who act righteously . . . their food and their rest” (21:6). Protology is combined with eschatology and, at the end, the conditions of Eden are restored.¹⁸²

In Apoc. Ab. 25–27 Abraham sees the destruction of the temple, because “the idol of jealousy,” like the idols his father used to make, was set up within it, alongside what resembled the art and beauty of God’s glory that lay beneath God’s throne. Abraham enquires of God, who explains that the temple was

179 Orlov 2008b: 67, see also Halperin 1988: 108.

180 Rowland 1982: 86–87 refers to “a deliberate attempt to exclude all reference to the human figure” of Ezek 1, as part of a trend away from describing God and his throne. See also Orlov 2009a: 831–32. For similar avoidance of anthropomorphism in the Targums see Halperin 1988: 120–23, in the twelfth song of the Qumran Sabbath Songs see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 346–50, and for the beginnings of this in the OT see Weinfeld 1972: 193–209 and Orlov 2008b: 58–60. Rowland 1982: 102–3 and Fossum 1985: 320 suggest that the throne is empty, and that Yahoel had formerly been seated there but had left the throne to accompany Abraham. However, Yahoel and God are distinguished in 10:3, where Abraham hears “the voice” speaking, apparently the same voice of 18:14 (see also 8:1–2; 16:3–4), and in 17:2 Yahoel worships God with Abraham. See also Gieschen 1998: 143. For fuller discussions of the avoidance of anthropomorphic representations of the deity in this text see Orlov 2008a: 33–53; 2008b: 53–70.

181 Cf. this description of Eden with 4 Ezra 7:53[123]; Rev 2:7; 22:2.

182 Rowland 1982: 144; Lee 2001: 176–77.

God's idea, a place for Abraham's descendants to offer prayers and make sacrifices, and that the idol was the cause of God's anger against the people of Abraham's tribe for their idolatry. The description of the temple in terms of the glory beneath the throne again depicts the temple as the link between earth and heaven.

In Apoc. Ab. 27 the temple is burned and plundered. Abraham asks for an explanation in 28, which God gives in 29.¹⁸³ In 29:14–21 God explains that the time will come when the heathen will be judged. Then, numerous righteous men, descendants of Abraham, will hasten in the glory of my name “to the place prepared beforehand for them, which you saw deserted in the picture. And they will live, being sustained by the sacrifices and offerings of justice and truth in the age of justice” (29:17–18). This place is the temple in Jerusalem, where right sacrifices will again be offered and all the people will be like priests,¹⁸⁴ gaining sustenance from feeding on the sacrifices.¹⁸⁵ The references to justice and truth are reminiscent of the description of Eden in 21:6, so that in the age to come when the temple is restored the conditions of Eden will also be restored and God will rejoice with his people (29:29). Whether it is God or humans who build this temple is unclear. What is clear is the reinstitution of the sacrificial cultus in the new age of righteousness and peace, with the temple in its former location.¹⁸⁶

Two features of this text can assist in the understanding of Hebrews. The first is the connection between the earthly temple at Horeb and the heavenly temple. The text does not portray an above and below typology, where the temple in heaven is the counterpart of the temple on earth. Rather Abraham offers sacrifices at the holy place of the “temple” on earth and finds himself in the heavenly throne room. In Hebrews Jesus ascends to the heavenly temple to be sure, but this temple also encompasses earth and heaven since the readers have access to it in the present (12:22–24).

The second feature is the anticipation of the renewed temple. In Hebrews the renewed temple is the eschatological temple. The only sacrifices associated

183 Lee 2001: 177 (note 36) suggests that the destruction described is of the first temple and is unsure whether it is typological of the destruction of the second temple, or whether the second temple is simply not acknowledged, since the original text of chapter 29 had been lost through Christian interpolation. However, given the placement of the true temple at Horeb in the flow of the narrative, Apoc. Ab. seems to downplay Zion as a location, and it seems likely that the Zion of his own time is simply ignored because it has been defiled. No temple imagery appears in 29:4–13.

184 Collins 1998: 230–31; Lee 2001: 177–78.

185 Kulik 2004: 53.

186 Lee 2001: 178.

with this temple are those of praise and good deeds (13:14–15). The Apocalypse of Abraham anticipates an earthly temple “in the place . . . which you saw deserted” (29:17), in which cultic rituals will be reinstituted and animal sacrifices again offered. There is none of this in Hebrews, since the sacrifice of Christ has rendered the former sacrifices obsolete.

Pseudo-Philo (LAB)

The Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, LAB) is a selective retelling of the biblical narrative from Adam to the death of Saul. Some incidents are omitted, others are revised or paraphrased sometimes with interpolated prayers and other expansions, and some new stories are introduced.¹⁸⁷ It is only extant in Latin, apparently a translation from a Greek *Vorlage*, in turn translated from Hebrew.¹⁸⁸ The work was probably composed in Palestine,¹⁸⁹ sometime from 50–150 CE. It was preserved with MSS of Philo, to whom it was ascribed in the Middle Ages, a tradition that cannot be sustained.¹⁹⁰ Jacobson argues cogently that it was written after the crisis

187 Nickelsburg 2005: 265–66. Harrington 1985: 297 describes it as an “imaginative retelling.” Murphy 1993: 4–13 discusses the genre of rewritten bible with respect to LAB suggesting that the aim of such activity was to make the stories of the Bible useful for the present, noting also that LAB was “one of the last examples of the rewritten Bible” (p. 13). Bauckham 1983: 33–34 suggests that the work was intended as a commentary on the biblical text, intended to be read alongside it. The work was introduced to the scholarly world by Cohn 1898: 277–332.

188 Harrington 1970: 503–14; 1985: 298–99; Nickelsburg 2005: 269; Murphy 2010: 440. A Hebrew original was first proposed by Cohn 1898: 311–13. There are eighteen complete and three fragmentary Latin manuscripts dated between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries (Harrington 1985: 298). Unless otherwise noted, the references to the Latin text and the English translation are taken from Jacobson 1996. See the brief critique of Jacobson’s translation in DesCamp 2007: 14. The fourteenth century manuscript of the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* contains a Hebrew text corresponding to parts of LAB, but is probably a retroversion from the Latin text and of little use as a textual witness for LAB (Harrington 1974: 2–5).

189 Jacobson 1996: 210–11. Harrington 1971: 16; 1985: 300 and Harrington and Horgan 1986: 240–41 propose a Palestinian biblical text as the source of the information in LAB although Jacobson 1996: 254–56 argues that this goes beyond the evidence, preferring the view that the author mostly depended upon his memory in quoting from the Bible.

190 Harrington 1985: 299–300; DesCamp 2007: 5–6; Murphy 2010: 440.

of 70 CE,¹⁹¹ and, if so, like other literature of the time, it represents an attempt to come to grips with this crisis.

Moses on Sinai

Pseudo-Philo relates the golden calf incident in chapter 12. In 12:1 Moses descends from the mountain coming down “to the place where the light of the sun and moon are.”¹⁹² He is unrecognisable with his face outshining the sun and moon. Since he had been on the mountain enveloped in thick darkness, the place of the sun and moon sounds like a description of the ordinary world. Apparently while Moses had been on the mountain, he had been “bathed with invisible light” an expression that could indicate that he had been in heaven.¹⁹³ If so, Sinai has the characteristics of a temple where Moses on the mountain is also in heaven where he encounters God, is transformed and becomes unrecognisable.¹⁹⁴

191 Jacobson 1996: 199–210. Certainty about the date is not possible, although a post 70 CE date does seem evident. The general consensus is that it comes from the first century CE (Harrington 1985: 299; Murphy 1993: 3, 6; 2010: 440; Jacobson 1996: 199–210; Fisk 2001: 34–45; Nickelsburg 2005: 269; DesCamp 2007: 3–4). The debate is often centred on the reading of 19:7, which could be taken to refer to the destruction of the second temple. Harrington 1985: 299 suggests a date prior to 70 CE from the claim of 22:8 that burnt offerings continue “even to this day.” However, this could simply reflect the situation of the persona of Pseudo-Philo in pre-Solomonic times. On the other hand, in 22:1–6 Joshua berates the people for building an altar rather than teaching Torah, a notion that could be connected with the replacement of temple service with Torah study after 70 CE (Nickelsburg 2005: 269). Vogel 1999: 255–58 argues for a post 70 CE date on the basis of the deference shown to Phinehas in 28:3, in the face of the dwindling authority of the priesthood after the destruction of the temple.

192 The sense of this verse is difficult in that there seem to be two descents, the first from the mountain (*et descendit Moyses*) where he had been in chapter 12; and the second to the place where the sun and the moon are (*descendit in locum ubi lumen solis et lune est*), a reading that Harrington 1985: 319 seems to adopt. It is better to follow Jacobson 1996: 110 who puts the second descent in parentheses, explaining the first.

193 Fletcher-Louis 2002: 8. Murphy 1993: 68–69 suggests that he had “access to the light of the world above.”

194 Meeks 1968: 354–71; VanderKam 1973: 133–34; Freedman 1981: 21; Lundquist 1983: 207–8; Houtman 2002: 3: 294. Pseudo-Philo shares with other texts a belief in the apotheosis of Moses, a notion that has its origins in Exod 7:1. See also Philo *Mos.* 1.155–158; Midr. Tan. Exod., Parashah 11 Parts I–IV. In LAB 61:8–9 the appearance of David is changed so that Goliath does not recognise him, seeing an angel instead. Not only does Goliath see an angel, but Pseudo-Philo emphasises that nobody recognises David, not even Saul. On this, see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 416–17. In LAB 64:6 the dead Samuel called up by the witch of Endor also appears as an angel.

In LAB 12:8–9 Moses ascends the mountain again, and prays for rebellious Israel, the vine planted by God.¹⁹⁵ While vine imagery refers to Israel several times in the Bible,¹⁹⁶ here the vine has roots in the deep (*abyssum*)¹⁹⁷ and shoots that reach God's "lofty seat" (*ad sedem tuam altissimam*).¹⁹⁸ Moses argues that if God destroys the vine, the link between the abyss, earth and heaven will cease to exist. Since Israel (the vine) extends from the abyss to God's lofty seat, Israel is pictured as inhabiting the sanctuary where God dwells.

The Tabernacle

Hebrews 8:5 appeals to Exod 25:40 to demonstrate that Moses was instructed to make everything according to the "pattern" (תבנית, LXX, τύπος) he was shown on the mountain. Like the author of Hebrews, Pseudo-Philo shows little interest in the details of the structure of the tabernacle. But in 11:15 he probably alludes to Exod 25:8 where God declares that he will come and dwell with them, and Exod 25:9 where God declares that he will show Moses the pattern of the tabernacle.¹⁹⁹ Pseudo-Philo simply alludes to the Exodus text and makes no further use of this information, although it probably indicates the divine origin of Israel's cult.²⁰⁰ In 13:1 he reports that Moses did as he was instructed,

195 For the imagery of Israel as a vine planted by YHWH, see LAB 18:10–11; 23:12; 28:4; 30:4; 39:7. In Exod 15:17 Israel is planted on the mountain of YHWH's possession. The reference in LAB 18:10–11 is further evidence of a Hebrew original. The context is the Balaam story and, in particular, the oracle in Num 24:3–9. The Hebrew text of Balaam's oracle describes Israel as trees planted by YHWH (24:6), while the LXX reads this verse as tents pitched by YHWH. In LAB there is no vision of tents, rather the imagery is one of planting by YHWH, reflecting a Hebrew *Vorlage*. See my discussion of the difference between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Num 24:6 in Church 2008: 148.

196 Isa 5:1–7; Ps 80:14–18; Ezek 17:1–21; John 15:1–8. See also Exod. Rab. 43:9. For a similar description, although this time of Egypt as a cedar, see Ezek 31:1–9.

197 Harrington 1985: 320 translates this with "abyss." In Ps 80:9 (MT 80:10) the vine takes "deep root" (ותשרש שרשיה), an expression Jacobson 1996: 497 claims is quoted here.

198 In Ps 80:10 (MT 11) the vine is so great the mountains are covered with its shade. For similar imagery of Israel as a plant linking Sheol, earth and heaven see 1QH^a XIV 17–21.

199 Harrington 1971: 7; 1985: 319. Jacobson 1996: 481 suggests that LAB conflates Exod 25:8, 40. While in Exod 25:8 God "dwells among" them (שכנתי בתוכם), Pseudo-Philo has "the tent of my glory among them." God is one step removed. His glory dwells among them in Exod 40:34–35. See also Lev 26:11; Ps 26:8. The active voice in Exod 25:8–9, rather than the passive in 25:40, is reflected here in LAB.

200 Murphy 1993: 66. See also LAB 13.

making “everything God commanded him”²⁰¹ and “everything that was shown to him.”²⁰²

Hayward claims that in making things according to their heavenly pattern Moses “is expected exactly to replicate on earth items which properly belong in heaven itself.”²⁰³ However, the text only refers to the “likeness” (*similitudo*) and “pattern” (*exemplar*) of the tabernacle and its furnishings (11:15), not to any physical heavenly temple with which the earthly is to correspond.²⁰⁴ The language of copy is absent, and there is no disparagement of the tabernacle simply because it is earthly and made by humans.

The Temple

Pseudo-Philo has several references to the temple (12:4, 9; 19:7; 26:12, 25–27) sometimes predicting that it will be destroyed because of the rebellion of the people. In 25–27 he anticipates an eschatological temple. In all of these texts Solomon’s temple is in view. The Second Temple is ignored.

In LAB 12:4 Pseudo-Philo anticipates Solomon’s temple and its destruction. God announces to Moses at the Golden Calf incident that the rebellion of the people at that time would not result in God’s rejection of his people, for he would “turn again and be reconciled with them so that a ‘house’ (*domus*) may be built for me among them.” At the same time God announces its destruction: this house was “a house that in turn will be destroyed because they will sin against me.”²⁰⁵ Similar ideas appear in God’s speech to Moses in 19:7, where Jerusalem (or the temple) is described as “the place where they will serve me for 740 years” (*locus, in quo mihi servient annos DCCXL*) before it is turned over

201 See Exod 40:16. The description that follows is largely taken from Exod 40.

202 See Exod 25:40; 26:30; 27:8; Num 8:4.

203 Hayward 1996: 159.

204 Hayward (ibid.: 159) notes that this “is not far removed from those Rabbinic texts which speak of the earthly temple corresponding to the heavenly dwelling place of God.” See Mek. de R. Ishmael Shirata 10; Exod. Rab. 33:3; Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 28:17; Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 15:17. But there is no hint of such correspondence in LAB.

205 There is an allusion to Isa 40:15 at the end of 12:4 in the words “a drop in a bucket” indicating that the text should be read as indicating that the judgement against Israel would extend to all humanity (Murphy 1993: 71; Fisk 2001: 170–71). There is also a note of hope in 12:10 where God records that the prayer of Moses has been heard, indicating that even this judgement is provisional (Fisk, p. 171). The wider context of Isa 40:15 indicates also that the destruction of the temple did not signal the end of the covenant relationship (Fisk, p. 174).

to enemies and destroyed.²⁰⁶ The fall of the temple is thus compared to the breaking of the tablets of the law.²⁰⁷ Even from the beginning, the temple was doomed to destruction.²⁰⁸ There is no suggestion that it will be rebuilt.

God's "house" (*domus*) is the subject of 12:9, the referent of which is debated. Harrington and Jacobson are probably correct in suggesting that God's house is the universe²⁰⁹ and, if so, the house is described in terms that reflect the account of the construction of the temple.²¹⁰ This is evidence of an understanding of the temple as a microcosm of the universe.²¹¹

Pseudo-Philo also refers to the temple when he recounts the covenant renewal of Josh 8 in LAB 21. He describes the altar at Mount Ebal, the sacrifices and the priestly blessings. In 21:10 Joshua blesses the people and anticipates the building of the temple, "a dwelling place for God" (*habitaculum Dei*). This is expanded in 22:9 with an editorial comment, "for until the house of the Lord was built in Jerusalem (*domus Domini in Ierusalem*)"²¹² and sacrifice offered on the new altar, the people were not prohibited from offering sacrifice there" (at Shiloh, v. 8). As early as Joshua, Pseudo-Philo predicts the Jerusalem temple,

206 Gäbel 2006: 85 reads this "place" as Jerusalem, as does Jacobson 1996: 624; Harrington 1985: 327 suggests the temple. See also Sifre Deut. 357.

207 Murphy 1993: 92; Fisk 2001: 271–76. In Exod 32:19 Moses smashes the tablets, while in LAB 19:7 God smashes them, indicating that God was involved in this event and the destruction of the temple. Both were God's judgement on the rebellion of the people (Fisk, pp. 272–73).

208 Gäbel 2006: 85; Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 115; Fisk 2001: 34. Jacobson 1996: 489 suggests that the use of the words *et ipsa iterum* ("in turn," perhaps "a second time") suggests the Second Temple, although he finds this difficult to construe in the context, noting as well that "we are at a third stage from the original" and care needs to be taken not to construe too much from the language. LAB 15:6 refers to a "sanctuary" (*sanc-timonia*), which YHWH taught them to build. Nevertheless, they abandoned him and God proposed to spread their bodies in the wilderness. In the context, the reference is to the wilderness tabernacle, also doomed from the start because of their rebellion, see Vogel 1999: 258–59.

209 Harrington 1985: 320; Jacobson 1996: 499–500.

210 Cf. 1 Kings 5:31; 7:10–11; 1 Chr 29:2; 2 Chr 3:6.

211 Jacobson 1996: 500. See Bereshit Rabbati P. 32, where it is claimed that Jerusalem was not submerged by the flood; Num. Rab. 12:13; Philo *Mos.* 2.88–127. Hayward 1996: 160 thinks this text reflects the suggestion that the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries correspond, with the heavenly sanctuary the counterpart of the earthly. But in this text there is no suggestion of a heavenly sanctuary above, with a corresponding sanctuary on earth below; rather, the sanctuary that Israel inhabits links heaven and earth.

212 See 1 Kings 7:40; 9:1. This is the only reference to Jerusalem in LAB.

with a direct line of continuity from the tabernacle to Gilgal, to Shiloh and to Solomon's temple.²¹³ Here, there is no prediction of the destruction of either Solomon's temple or the second temple. While the text predicts that Solomon's temple will be destroyed, it is not disparaged. It is destroyed because of the rebellion of the people, not for any inherent failure.

The Heavenly Temple

In Deut 34 YHWH shows Moses the extent of the land from Mount Nebo. Pseudo-Philo recounts these events in 19:10–13 and, again, the biblical narrative is expanded. As well as showing Moses the land, God shows him four “places” (*loci*) that are apparently in heaven: the place where the clouds draw up water to water the whole earth; the place from where the river takes its water; the place in the firmament from which the holy land drinks; and the place from where God rained down manna in the wilderness. The clouds drawing up water to water the whole earth is an allusion to Gen 2:6²¹⁴ and the four places, along with the emphasis on water and rain echo the four rivers of Eden,²¹⁵ indicating that God is showing Moses the heavenly temple. Just as the rivers from the primeval Eden sanctuary watered the earth, so waters from the heavenly sanctuary water “the holy land” (*terra sancta*).²¹⁶

God also gives Moses the measurements of the sanctuary, again presumably the Jerusalem temple,²¹⁷ “the number of the sacrifices” and “the signs by which

213 There are two temporal markers in 22:8, 9. In 22:8 sacrifices are offered in Gilgal “unto this day” (*usque in hodiernum diem*), and in 22:9 sacrifices were offered in Shiloh until that day (*usque in illam diem*), i.e. the day on which sacrifices were offered in Solomon's temple. Harrington 1985: 232 proposes that the temporal marker in 22:8 (until this day) indicates a date of composition prior to 70 CE. However, it is better to see these either as simple temporal markers inserted by Pseudo-Philo in line with his pre-Solomonic persona, or comments by a narrator.

214 Jacobson 1996: 634.

215 Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 2: 132. Murphy 1993: 93. The allusion to Gen 2:10–13 is disputed by Jacobson 1996: 634. While there is nothing explicit in the text, the definite allusion to Gen 2:6, the four “places” (compare the “place” where the people will serve YHWH in 19:7) and the emphasis on water and rain indicates that temple symbolism is in the frame in this text.

216 The “holy land” may also refer to Jerusalem as the pinnacle of the land. See Jacobson 1996: 635; Lee 2001: 188.

217 Jacobson 1996: 636. In 19:7 God told Moses that he would show him the land and the “place where they would serve him for 740 years,” and in 19:10–13 God does that. Lee 2001: 187 suggests that the sanctuary in 19:10 is the heavenly sanctuary, because this and the sacrifices and the signs of heaven are “heavenly scenes.” However, the references to sacrifices

men shall interpret the heaven.”²¹⁸ However, these are only of limited duration, as God will soon shorten the time and bring the present order to an end.²¹⁹ Moses, however, is not affected by this as he is dwelling “in the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time” (19:12). At the end of time, he will be joined by all who sleep, so that they too may dwell “in the place of the sanctuary (*locus sanctificationis*) that I showed you” (19:13).²²⁰ The immortal dwelling place and the place of the sanctuary are two different places. The former is where the dead remain until the resurrection and the latter is a new temple to be built on earth at the end of time.²²¹ While Pseudo-Philo anticipates Solomon’s temple and its destruction, he also holds to a belief in its heavenly origin and to the notion of a temple as “heaven on earth.” He also anticipates a new temple to be built at the end of time.

would militate against this, since sacrifice in heaven is unlikely. Also, the land that God showed Moses is not part of a “heavenly scene,” nor is the land of Egypt (if this reading is correct, see Jacobson 1996: 635). God shows Moses the land, then the four places in heaven and then the sanctuary, thus the text begins and ends on earth, enclosing the four heavenly scenes.

- 218 Murphy 1993: 93 finds here a reference to the importance of the Israelite cult, while Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 132 read the verse as a reference to the signs of the Zodiac, a suggestion that Jacobson 1996: 637 is attracted to, although he admits that he cannot understand its “relevance” or “appropriateness.” That it is forbidden knowledge tends to support this view.
- 219 Hayward 1996: 165–66. LAB 19:13 refers to “this present heaven (*celum*)” in the context of Moses’ immortal dwelling place not subject to time. Harrington 1985: 328 proposes emending the text to read “this present age” (*seculum*), and Jacobson 1996: 644 sets out palaeographical arguments to support this emendation.
- 220 For *sanctificatio* as “sanctuary” see footnote 159 in chapter 4 (above).
- 221 Murphy 1993: 94 refers to “paradise” as a possible referent for the place of the sanctuary. Jacobson 1996: 645 is unclear, referring first to “Jerusalem and the Temple” (see Isa 52:1; 60:13; Ps 24:3; Eccl 8:10), and then to “Paradise” and the “Celestial Jerusalem.” Hofius 1970b: 65 proposes that both of these places are the same, and that they “kann nichts anderes sein, als das 19,10 erwähnte himmlische ‘sanctuarium.’” Lee 2001: 189 suggests a future earthly Jerusalem, as does Halpern-Amaru 1994: 92 and Gäbel 2006: 85–86. On p. 84 Gäbel refers to 28:6–9, which he reads as a vision of heaven, where the souls of the dead will remain for 7,000 years until they are transformed. On the other hand, Murphy 1993: 132–33 reads that text as a vision of all of human history. This seems to be a more coherent reading since the vision begins with the creation and ends with the transformation of humanity.

Kenaz and the Twelve Stones

The history of the temple, its destruction and eschatological restoration are told in the story of Kenaz, who is only a name in the Bible,²²² although Pseudo-Philo has built a long story around him (LAB 25–27). He is second in importance only to Moses.²²³ He first appears in 25:2 where he is appointed by lot to be Israel's first judge succeeding Joshua. He demands that the members of each tribe confess their sins, and the tribe of Asher confesses to secreting away seven precious stones from Havilah that had been used in the idolatrous Amorite sanctuary (25:10–12). God commands Kenaz to set these seven stones on a mountain-top from where his angel will take them and cast them into the depths of the sea (26:4).²²⁴ Following this, an angel brings twelve other stones from Havilah to replace the seven taken by the first angel (26:4).²²⁵ These twelve stones, corresponding to the twelve stones on the breastplate of the high priest, are to be set on the ephod and engraved with the names of the tribes (Exod 28:15–21). All this happens as predicted (LAB 26:8–11).

In 26:12 God commands Kenaz to place the twelve stones in the Ark of the Covenant, where they are to remain until “Jahel” builds a “house” (*domus*) in God's name.²²⁶ In the following verse God predicts that when the sins of his people reach full measure their enemies will come and destroy “their house”

222 The name Kenaz appears in several texts. He is a descendant of Esau in Gen 36:11, 15, 42; 1 Chr 1:36, 53. The Kenaz who is the subject in LAB appears in Josh 15:17; Judg 1:13 where he is identified as the brother of Caleb and the father of Othniel who took Kiriath-Sepher. In Judg 3:9, 11 Othniel the son of Kenaz is the first judge of Israel, who gave the Israelites rest for forty years. Kenaz fades out of the picture, apart from the genealogical record in 1 Chr 4:13. Caleb also had a grandson called Kenaz (1 Chr 4:15). Pseudo-Philo has “created” the figure of Kenaz as Caleb's son (Nickelsburg 1980: 54).

223 Ibid.: 54; Lee 2001: 190.

224 The identity of the mountain is obscure. Harrington 1985: 337 suggests either Shechem or Shiloh. Gäbel 2006: 89 connects the seven idolatrous stones with the seven planets of the Zodiac and also with the signs of the heavens in 19:10.

225 Hayward 1992a: 12 connects Havilah and Paradise and notes that Pseudo-Philo is a very early witness connecting the precious stones of the high priest's ephod with Eden. In Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 35:27 these stones come from Pishon (פִּישׁוֹן), the river that flows around the land of Havilah (Gen 2:11).

226 Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 2: 158 proposes that the text has been corrupted from the Hebrew for the name Ithiel, one of ten names attributed to Solomon (see Ginzberg 1913–1967: 4: 125; 6: 183, who explains the corruption from אִתִּיאל to אֵל). See also Harrington 1985: 338; Murphy 1993: 124; Jacobson 1996: 773. For the words “will build a house in my name” (*edificet domum in nomine meo*) see 2 Sam 7:13 (referring to Solomon).

(*domus ipsorum*).²²⁷ God will rescue the stones and return them to the place from where they were taken at the beginning (Havilah?), where they will remain until God remembers the “world” (*seculum*) and visits the people of the “earth” (*terra*). At that time he will take the stones, along with other vastly superior ones whose existence will light up the world, so much so that the light of the sun and moon will no longer be needed.²²⁸ The implication is that God will build an eschatological temple where these stones will function.²²⁹ At the conclusion of the story, the twelve stones are present in the ark of the covenant of the Lord, “until this day,” waiting until the establishment of the eschatological temple.²³⁰

The story of the twelve stones demonstrates continuity between the primeval sanctuary with its reference to Havilah, the source of the gold and precious stones of the Eden sanctuary (Gen 2:11–12),²³¹ the Ark of the Covenant and the temple, and the eschatological sanctuary that God will build. The destruction of the first temple is clear in 26:13, however, there is no second temple; rather,

227 That God should call the temple “their house” is odd, and in Jacobson’s opinion “impossible,” although 2 Chr 36:17 refers to *מקדשם* (“their sanctuary”). Jacobson 1996: 774 proposes that it could be equivalent to “the house[hold] of Israel.” Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 2: 158 and Harrington 1985: 338 propose that a Hebrew *Vorlage* *ביתי* (“my house”) could have been confused for *ביתו* (“his house”), although *domus ipsorum* would translate *ביתם* (“their house”).

228 LAB 26:13 cites Isa 64:4, indicating the “otherworldly origin of the eschatological stones” (Murphy 1993: 124).

229 Hayward 1992a: 13 argues that the connection between the stones, paradise and the temple show that what Adam lost in Eden (26:6) is restored in the temple service. Lee 2001: 191 argues that the stones “represent” paradise, giving access to paradise in the temple. Even so, the present temple service is temporary, until the conditions of paradise are restored in the eschaton (Hayward 1992a: 13).

230 Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 2: 158–59 suggest that this indicates a date of writing prior to 70 CE, suggesting at the same time that Pseudo-Philo situates himself at the time of Kenaz, so would not necessarily know that there was no ark of the covenant in the second temple, see also Murphy 1993: 125. Jacobson 1996: 775 finds here evidence of a date after 70 CE, since the author of LAB and his readers would have known that “the priestly stones were in fact intact and in place during the second temple.” See Josephus, *Ant.* 3.218; Let. Aris. 97. t. Sotah 13.2 notes that the Urim and Thummim ceased when the first temple was destroyed. B. Yoma 21b lists five things missing from the Second Temple: the ark, the ark cover and cherubim, the fire from heaven and the divine presence. The Urim and Thummim were present, but not as helpful as previously.

231 Perrot, Bogaert, Cazeaux and Harrington 1976: 2: 155.

the text anticipates the eschatological temple,²³² for “God’s resolution of Israel’s problems must await the eschaton.”²³³ This resolution involves returning to the beginning, with the eschatological sanctuary containing precious stones from the protological sanctuary.

Conclusion

Pseudo-Philo’s LAB contains diverse material. Like Hebrews, the text never refers to the second temple and only once, in what may be a slip-up, does it refer to Jerusalem. Pseudo-Philo explains the divine origin of the Israelite cult from Exod 25:8–9. He sees a line of continuity from the tabernacle to the shrines at Gilgal and Shiloh and to the temple, and also recognises that the temple will ultimately be destroyed. God shows Moses the heavenly temple from Mount Nebo and explains that after his death he will be in an immortal dwelling place (paradise?), until he is joined by all who sleep in “the place of the sanctuary,” that is, the heavenly temple. Finally, the heavenly temple becomes an eschatological temple, built by God, and corresponding to the protological temple of Eden. Unlike the eschatological temple in Hebrews, this temple will exist on earth as a building. In Hebrews the temple to be built by God in the last days has been inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God and is now accessible to God’s people. But this is a metaphorical temple, not a physical building.

Sibylline Oracles Book 4

Sibylline Oracles Book 4 is a composite text built around a central section that recounts the history of the world in ten generations (vv. 47–48), encompassing four kingdoms from the Assyrians to the Macedonians (vv. 49–101).²³⁴ Since some of the detail in vv. 88–101 (the Macedonian kingdom) can be related to the conquests of Alexander, this section can probably be dated around that time.²³⁵ The section on the rise of Rome (vv. 102–151) that follows is not

232 God removes the stones in 587 BCE, and will replace them not in the second temple, but in the eschatological temple (see Murphy 1993: 124).

233 Nickelsburg 1980: 55.

234 Collins 1983b: 381; Davila 2005b: 188. Lanchester 1913: 372–73 argued that the entire book was a single composition around 80 CE. See my introduction to the Sib. Or. in chapter 2 (above).

235 Collins 1974a: 370–71; 1983b: 381.

incorporated into the ten-generation schema and was probably added later.²³⁶ This section refers to an earthquake in Laodicea (v. 107, 60 CE), the destruction of the temple (vv. 115–118, 125–126), and the eruption of Vesuvius (v. 139, 79 CE), suggesting a date for this section around 80 CE.²³⁷ The remainder of the book (vv. 1–48, 152–192) contains religious teachings from a redactor.²³⁸

The provenance is difficult to pin down. The climax of the ten generation schema is the fall of Macedonia, and Collins proposes “any place that was subject to Macedonia” as the place of origin.²³⁹ Agnosticism on this issue may be the wisest course.²⁴⁰ It is difficult to judge whether it is a Jewish or Christian composition, and while Collins finds “no trace of Christian redaction,”²⁴¹ vv. 162–170 do enjoin baptism, prayer and praise to escape the judgement of God and this, along with the polemic against temples and temple worship, must leave that possibility open.²⁴²

While the section on the destruction of Jerusalem is brief, it concentrates on the sack of “the great temple of God” (νηὸν δὲ θεοῦ μέγαν, v. 116), also referred to as “the temple of Jerusalem” (νηὸν . . . Σολύμων, v. 126).²⁴³ The leader of Rome (Titus) comes to destroy “the great land of the Jews with its wide street” (Ἰουδαίων ὁλέσει μεγάλην χθόνα εὐρύαγυιαν, v. 127). That only Jerusalem and the temple are singled out, and that the temple is described as “the great temple of God,” indicate the significance of Jerusalem and the temple.²⁴⁴

236 Collins 1974a: 373; 1987: 427; Lucas 1989: 186.

237 Lanchester 1913: 373; Nikiprowetzky 1972: 29–30; Collins 1983b: 382; Goodman 1986: 643.

238 Collins 1983b: 381.

239 Ibid.: 381. On p. 382 and in other publications Collins proposes Syria or the Jordan Valley. Noack 1963: 97 proposes Egyptian provenance on the basis of numerous references to Egypt. But the text only refers to Egypt once (v. 72). Nikiprowetzky 1972: 58 proposes Egypt on the basis of his assumption that all the Jewish Sibylline oracles belong together.

240 Goodman 1986: 643.

241 Collins 1983b: 381.

242 Davila 2005b: 188–90 finds nothing pointing to Jewish authorship, and leaves open the possibility of “a radically Hellenizing, baptizing Jew” or “a god-fearer or Jewish or gentile Christian.” On the other hand, there is no reference to Christ, which could be expected in the context of the discussion of resurrection in vv. 187–192, see Goodman 1986: 642.

243 Σόλυμα is “Jerusalem,” as in Josephus *Ant.* 1.180; 7.67; *J.* W. 6.438.

244 Collins 1974a: 367–68 suggests that the statements about the destruction are “simple historical statements” and the sibyllist does not attach special significance to them. But the way the temple is described as “the great temple of God,” and the fact that Jerusalem and the temple are singled out for special mention, are significant indicators of a positive attitude to the temple. Simon 1983: 230–231 refers to a “certain warmth towards the temple.” The reference to the eruption of Vesuvius (vv. 130–134) is also significant. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 234; 1972: 35 suggests that this is God’s punishment for the destruction of the temple,

However, if Jerusalem and the temple are significant here, the opening verses give a quite different perspective. The sibyllist begins with polemic against idolatry. She claims to be a messenger of “the great God whom no human hands fashioned . . . of stone,” and the God who “does not have a stone dragged into a temple as a dwelling place” (οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶκον ἔχει ναῶν λίθον ἐλκυσθέντα, v. 8).²⁴⁵ Rather, he has a house “that cannot be seen from the earth, or measured with mortal eyes, since it was not formed by mortal hands” (ἀλλ’ ὃν ἰδεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ χθονὸς οὐδὲ μετρήσαι ὄμμασιν ἐν θνητοῖς, οὐ πλασθέντα χερσὶ θνητῇ, vv. 10–11). This text starts as polemic against idolatry, and concludes as polemic against temples made by humans, claiming that God dwells in a heavenly temple, not made by any mortal hand.²⁴⁶ The polemic continues in vv. 24–30 where the humans who put their trust in the great God are described as happy, “since they reject all temples” (οἱ νηοὺς μὲν ἅπαντας ἀπαρνήσονται, v. 27), as well as altars and stone statues of handmade images stained with the blood of animal sacrifices. The polemic is ultimately against idolatry, and polemic against the Jerusalem temple is caught up in that.²⁴⁷ No human temple, not even that in Jerusalem, is suitable for the worship of God.

The negative attitude to the temple and the cult, and the positive attitude to baptism, prayer and repentance, represent the response of one ancient author (and perhaps a later redactor) to the crisis of 70 CE. The tension in the layers of this text is clear. On the one hand, the message to the readers is that the

while Collins 1974a: 368 attributes this to Rome’s treatment of the Jews (vv. 135–136). But surely the Jews and their temple must be held together, as in vv 125–126, and God’s judgement attributed to the entire complex of events from 66–70 CE. As Collins himself (1974c: 44) points out with respect to Sib. Or. 3, “[t]he destruction of the temple was equivalent to the destruction of the people.” See also Goodman 1986: 642; Chester 1991: 65–68.

245 This is my translation of the text in Geffcken 1902a: 91. For the sense of ἔχω as “have something as something,” see BDAG 420, s.v. ἔχω 2a, and Matt 3:9. Collins 1983b: 384 adopts the variant reading of the Ψ manuscript group οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶκον ἔχει ναὸν λίθον ἰδρυθέντα, and translates “he does not have a house, a stone set up as a temple.” In 1974a: 366 Collins translates, “God ‘does not have a house, stone drawn to the temple’.”

246 Chester 1991: 63–64 argues that the text represents polemic against idolatry while Collins’s translation represents polemic against temples. However, the sense is almost the same as Chester (p. 66) ultimately concedes: “[h]ence it appears most likely that the present passage disallows the possibility of God having any material habitation or temple.” See also Gäbel 2006: 99. Dunn 2006: 89–90 clarifies that the term “made with hands” refers to the manufacture of idols. See LXX Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 31:7; 46:6; Dan 5:4, 23; 6:28; Jdt 8:18; Wis 14:8.

247 Collins 1974a: 369; 1987: 428–29; Simon 1983: 228–29. Here, temple and sacrifice *per se* are rejected, something highly unusual in Judaism, see Collins 1974a: 378. Noack 1963: 98; Nikiprowetzky 1970: 236–37; 1972: 56–57 argues that only pagan temples are condemned.

eruption of Vesuvius was God's judgement on Rome for their treatment of the people and the temple. On the other hand, there is the underlying theological message that the entire enterprise of temple and cult is a misguided attempt at the worship of God, and ultimately temple and cult must be rejected.

Sibylline Oracles Book 5

A consensus has developed that the final form of Sib. Or. 5 can be dated sometime between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Bar-Kochba revolt (70–132 CE).²⁴⁸ The former event is referred to in vv. 115–129, and there is generous praise for Hadrian in vv. 47–50.²⁴⁹ Verses 1–51 introduce the book with a review of history up to Hadrian, and vv. 435–450 provide a conclusion that includes details of an Egyptian temple-building project and its destruction by the Ethiopians, and of a battle in the heavens. The remainder of the book consists of a series of oracles (52–110, 111–178, 179–285, 286–434), held together by common themes: (1) oracles against various nations; (2) the eschatological return of Nero; (3) the coming of a saviour figure; and (4) a prediction of destruction.²⁵⁰ This common theme probably indicates a unified composition. An Egyptian provenance is generally accepted,²⁵¹ with most scholars opting for Jewish authorship, although vv. 256–259 may be a Christian interpolation.²⁵²

248 Collins 1974c: 73–75; 1984a: 371; 2000a: 143–44; Simon 1983: 223–24; Goodman 1986: 643–45; Chester 1991: 38; Barclay 1996: 227–28.

249 Hadrian reigned from 117–138, but brutally suppressed the Bar-Kochba revolt in 135 (Evans 2000: 1112–14). As Simon 1983: 223–24 and Goodman 1986: 645 note, a positive estimation of Hadrian after that date would be unlikely. Verse 51 seems to refer to Marcus Aurelius (161–180), and since this is juxtaposed with the positive treatment of Hadrian, most scholars consider it to be a later addition (Lanchester 1913: 373; Collins 1983b: 390; 1984a: 371; Davila 2005b: 186).

250 Collins 1974c: 74–75 (and elsewhere); Goodman 1986: 644.

251 Collins 1974c: 75; 1984a: 372; Goodman 1986: 645; Lee 2001: 197–98.

252 Collins 1983b: 390–91. Davila 2005b: 186–89 proposes three scenarios: (1) a Jewish work with vv. 256–259 a Christian interpolation; (2) a Jewish-Christian work as a whole, with no interpolation; and (3) a work by a Gentile God-fearer, again with a Christian interpolation. He notes that there are no references to “circumcision, Jewish dietary rules, the sabbath, or the Jewish festivals . . .” (p. 189). A decision on these options, none of which can be definitively established or dismissed, is outside my scope. Nikiprowetzky 1972: 58–65, and O'Neill 1991: 87–102 argue for what amounts to Davila's second option.

The Return of Nero

Book 5 builds on the legend of Nero's return, which also appears in Sib. Or. 3:63–74 where Nero is identified with Beliar, and in Sib. Or. 4:138 where he is “the fugitive from Rome” who will come and destroy Cyprus and Antioch.²⁵³ This myth is considerably developed in Sib. Or. 5, where Nero is depicted both as God's instrument to punish Rome for its part in the destruction of the temple, and also as the eschatological enemy of God's people who will come to destroy the rebuilt city and temple. In both roles he is connected with the temple.²⁵⁴

The second oracle describes the sack of Jerusalem in the past tense. Nero appears in v. 130 as a great king of great Rome and a god-like man who will flee from “Babylon” (Rome),²⁵⁵ since he would be hated by all mortals and noble men. The reasons for this hatred are given in vv. 150–154: he took “the temple built by God and burned the citizens and people who entered it” (ναὸν θεότευκτον ἔλεν καὶ ἔφλεξε πολίτας λαοὺς εἰσανιόντας, vv. 150–151). The destruction of the temple was accompanied by cosmic phenomena (“the whole creation was shaken” <δλ>η κτίσις ἐξετινάχθη, v. 152),²⁵⁶ kings were destroyed, while those who continued to rule “destroyed a great city and righteous people” (ἐξόλεσαν μεγάλην τε πόλιν λαόν τε δίκαιον, v. 154). The descriptions of Jerusalem, the city and the people, as well as the attendant cosmic phenomena, demonstrate the cosmic implications of the destruction of the temple. These events shook the foundations of the world and society.

The other three oracles all predict the return of Nero. In vv. 214–226 he returns to destroy Corinth, because of Rome's attack on Jerusalem. Here, he comes “on account of the great city and the righteous people preserved through everything” (εἵνεκα τῆς μεγάλης πόλεως λαοῦ τε δικαίου σωζομένου διὰ παντός, vv. 226–227). This is the same great city of v. 154 and the same righteous people (the Jews).²⁵⁷ God will send Nero to strike at the heart of the Roman Empire (vv. 220–224) as retribution for the campaign against Jerusalem.

253 Bauckham 1993: 414–16, 419–21; Collins 1974c: 86–87.

254 For discussions of the legend of Nero's return see Collins 1974c: 80–87; Bauckham 1993: 407–23. For Nero's dual role in Sib. Or. 5 see Barclay 1996: 226–27; Lee 2001: 199. The legend is often referred to as Nero *redivivus*, although, as Collins 1974c: 188 and Bauckham 1993: 421–23 note, this term is inappropriate as initially Nero was not expected to rise from the dead. Rather, the mysterious events surrounding his death gave rise to the suggestion that he had fled to Parthia (Collins 1974c: 80–81), from where he would return to conquer Rome and rule the world.

255 Collins 1983b: 396. As elsewhere in Sib. Or., Babylon is a cipher for Rome.

256 The brackets around <δλ>η indicate a textual variant. The Φ and Ψ manuscripts read the definite article (ἡ), while Alexandre proposed δλη (Geffcken 1902a: 111).

257 Collins 1983b: 398.

The fourth oracle (vv. 361–410) contains the most detailed description of the return of Nero. He is introduced as a matricide who will sweep in like an eschatological enemy and destroy every land and all people (vv. 363–385).²⁵⁸ Verses 386–396 are addressed to the people of Rome, also addressed as matricides, and berated for sexual perversion and revelry. Rome will be silenced when Nero comes. Then, in a digression, the sibyllist turns and describes the destruction of the temple. It was “a desirable house” (πεποθημένος οἶκος, v. 397), the “second house” (δεύτερος. . . οἶκος, v. 398) and “a house ever-flourishing, a watchful temple of God” (οἶκος αἰεὶ θάλλοντα, θεοῦ τηρήμων ναός, v. 400). It had been birthed “by holy people who hoped it would always be imperishable” (ἐξ ἁγίων γεγαῶτα καὶ ἄφθιτον αἰὲν ἔόντα, v. 401). Verses 403–407 describe this people as faithful to the one true God, always avoiding idolatry, and offering sacrifices to God alone, and vv. 408–410 revert to the destruction of the temple by “a certain insignificant and impure king,” probably Titus, since Nero is elsewhere described in grandiose terms.²⁵⁹

The significance of the temple and the holiness and faithfulness of the people are in stark contrast to the figures of Nero and his armies. But, because of Nero and his armies, great disaster will come upon Rome, and the oracle ends by announcing the destruction of Titus “by immortal hands when he left the land” (αὐτὸς δ’ ὤλετο χερσὶν ὑπ’ ἀθανάτοις ἀποβὰς γῆς, v. 411)²⁶⁰ as a sign to “those who would think that they might sack such a great city” (ὥστε δοκεῖν ἑτέρους μεγάλην πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι, v. 413). But while his death was not miraculous in any way,²⁶¹ his death sentence was carried out by God, for daring to destroy Jerusalem.

The legend of the return of Nero was a tool in the hand of the sibyllist to declare that God would judge Rome for Rome’s part in destroying the temple. That was a catastrophe of the highest order with repercussions throughout the world and the universe. God would not leave the perpetrators unpunished.

Earlier, however, Nero has a different role. In vv. 93–100 he is “the Persian one” who will come against Egypt initially, and then all Asia. The climax, when he has “formidable height and unseemly daring,” v. 106),²⁶² is when he will

258 Bauckham 1993: 408 discusses Nero the matricide.

259 Barclay 1996: 226.

260 For this text see the critical apparatus in Geffcken 1902a: 124. Geffcken proposes this emendation in place of the texts preserved in both the Φ and Ψ MS groups, which make little sense (αὐτὸς δ’ ὤλετο χέρσον ἂπ’ ἀθανάτην ἐπιβὰς γῆν, “by an immortal having come upon a barren land”).

261 Collins 1983b: 403.

262 This translation is from Collins (ibid.: 395).

come, seeking “to utterly destroy the city of the blessed ones” (ἥξει καὶ μακάρων ἐθέλων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξει, v. 106), that is, Jerusalem. Jerusalem has been rebuilt, and now the eschatological enemy of God’s people returns to destroy it, an event that will precipitate the coming of an eschatological redeemer.

The Eschatological Redeemer

Alongside Nero, another figure appears in various guises, again in all four oracles. In the first oracle he is described as “a certain king sent from God against Nero,” v. 108).²⁶³ This king will execute the judgement of the imperishable God and destroy all the kings and noble men. Those who dare to destroy God’s people and city will face God’s judgement.²⁶⁴

The same theme appears in the second oracle, where cosmic destruction is announced in vv. 151–161. In this case, after the fourth year,²⁶⁵ “a great star will shine” (λάμψη μέγας ἀστήρ, v. 155). The star is probably an allusion to the star of Balaam’s oracle (Num 24:17) or some other saviour figure, since these were frequently designated as stars in the ancient world.²⁶⁶ This “great star from heaven” (οὐρανόθεν ἀστήρ μέγας, v. 159) would “burn the deep sea and Babylon (Rome),²⁶⁷ and the land of Italy,” vv. 159–160. The reason for the conflagration was because Rome was the cause of many holy, faithful Hebrews and true people perishing (vv. 160–161). There is no suggestion that the Hebrew people were to blame for the disaster. They were faithful to God, but Rome had attacked them and they had perished. On the other hand, the reference to the star from heaven shows the cosmological nature of the eschatological redeemer. Deliverance comes not from politics, but from the intervention of God in human affairs.²⁶⁸

The saviour figure is announced in the third oracle as a prominent man “from the sky” (ἀπ’ αἰθέρος, v. 256), “the noblest of the Hebrews,” v. 258. He will cause the sun to stand still, an allusion to Josh 10:12,²⁶⁹ and speak with fair

²⁶³ In Sib. Or. 3 deliverance was from a political “seventh king” of Egypt. Here, it is from God himself, see Collins 2000a: 148–49. Chester 1991: 48–56 discusses whether it is appropriate to refer to this figure in messianic terms.

²⁶⁴ Collins 1974c: 87–88 connects this oracle with 3:286 and the reference there to Cyrus.

²⁶⁵ A reference to the “three and a half times” of Dan 7:25; 12:7 (Collins 1983b: 397).

²⁶⁶ Bar Kochba (son of a star) is one of these. See the discussion in Collins 1974c: 89–92; 1983b: 392. See also Rev 8:10; 9:1–11; 22:16.

²⁶⁷ Collins 1974c: 89.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.: 91.

²⁶⁹ Davila 2005b: 188. See especially his discussion in footnote 14.

speech and holy lips.²⁷⁰ While the redeemer figure of the first two oracles came to destroy the enemies of God's people, in this oracle and the next he comes to restore Jerusalem.²⁷¹ In vv. 247–252, a time of peace is announced when the divine and heavenly race of the blessed Jews will “live around the city of God in the middle of the earth” (περιναιετάουσι θεοῦ πόλιν ἐν μεσογαίῳ, v. 250).²⁷² These people will be exalted to the dark clouds and the walls of Jerusalem will extend even to Joppa. This text reflects the so-called *omphalos* myth, where Jerusalem is the navel of the earth, and other texts where the restored city of Jerusalem is of gigantic proportions.²⁷³ It looks to the future restoration of Jerusalem, “a beautiful city, inspired with hymns” (καλὴ πόλις, ἔνθεος ὕμνων, v. 263). The messianic figure builds the new Jerusalem.²⁷⁴ Verse 268 suggests that a restored temple is anticipated, where God will be honoured “with all sorts of sacrifices” (παντοίαις θυσίαισι). This oracle implies a rebuilt city and temple, with the restoration of the cult, and God's people inhabiting the land in peace and prosperity.

The fourth oracle (vv. 414–434) becomes more explicit. Here, the saviour figure is “a blessed man from the clouds of heaven” (οὐρανίων νώτων ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης, v. 414).²⁷⁵ While the clouds of heaven are reminiscent of Dan 7:25, the sceptre in his hand, given by God, is another allusion to Balaam's oracle (Num 24:17). This one destroys evil doers and restores all things for the people of God. He rebuilds Jerusalem and the temple. Jerusalem is “the city which God

270 The allusion to Joshua (Greek Ἰησοῦς) may have led to v. 257 (ὃς παλάμας ἤπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλου πολυκάρπου, “who stretched out his hands upon fruitful wood”), which appears to be a Christian interpolation referring to the crucifixion of Jesus. Whatever is done with this text, vv. 256–259 are a piece of messianism, referring to a prominent man from the sky. Collins 1974c: 88 notes that the structure of the passage requires a saving figure here, and this Christian interpolation probably replaces a Jewish one.

271 Collins 2000a: 149–50.

272 Translation from Collins 1983b: 399.

273 Chester 1991: 59–60; Lee 2001: 200. For Jerusalem as the centre of the earth see Ezek 38:12; Jub. 8:19; 1 En. 26:1, and for the gigantic proportions of Jerusalem see my discussion of 11QNJ in chapter 3 (above). Such texts include 4Q554 1 1 9–22; 1 En. 90:29, 36; 11QTemple LX–LXV; Rev 21:16. These texts depend initially on the vision of Ezek 40–48. The combination of these two motifs demonstrates the subversive nature of the text: “Jerusalem, not Rome is the centre and hub of the whole earth” (Chester 1991: 62).

274 Lee 2001: 200.

275 This one is said to have come (aorist tense–“used by anticipation,” Collins 1983b: 403). The word μακαρίτης, here translated “blessed,” is used for the “blessed dead,” see *LSJ* 1074. If the word is understood with this sense, the correspondence with Nero *redivivus* may be significant. Just as Nero returns from the dead to bring God's judgement on Rome, so also the saviour figure returns from the dead to bring salvation.

desired" (πόλις, ἣν ἐπόθησε θεός, v. 420)²⁷⁶ made more brilliant than stars, sun and moon. Not only this, "he also made a holy place" (ἅγιόν τ' ἐποίησεν, v. 422)²⁷⁷ that was "very beautiful" (καλὸν περικαλλέα, v. 423).²⁷⁸ He built "a great and immense tower over many stadia" (πολλοῖς ἐν σταδίοισι μέγαν καὶ ἀπείρονα πύργον, v. 425), "touching the clouds and visible to all" (αὐτῶν ἀπτόμενον νεφέων καὶ πᾶσιν ὁρατόν, v. 425). As in the third oracle, these verses draw on the traditions of the gigantic proportions of the restored Jerusalem.

Then, drawing on such texts as Isa 2:2–4; Mic 4:1–4; Zech 8:20–23, the sibyllist announces that all the faithful see the restored Jerusalem, and people from the East and the West sing out the glory of God. These events spell the end of terrible things in the earth: adultery, murder, war and pederasty. The oracle closes by announcing that this takes place when "the high-thundering God, creator of the greatest temple accomplishes these things." This is the final age when God will restore Jerusalem and build the eschatological temple and his people will live in peace.²⁷⁹ This is, however, an entirely earthly temple, albeit of gigantic proportions, with the cult restored and all nations gathering in it to worship God.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁶ See Ps 78:68–72.

²⁷⁷ The text is corrupt. The Φ group of MSS read ἅγιόν τ' ἐποίησεν, and the Ψ MSS ἅγιόν ποτ' ἐποίησεν. Geffcken 1902a: 124 notes that Rzach proposed ἅγιόν τ' οἶκον ἐποίησεν, and Castalio ἅγιόν τε ναὸν ἐποίησεν. Whichever reading is adopted, there is a reference to the building of a temple or sanctuary.

²⁷⁸ This verse begins with the word ἑνσαρκος (related to flesh, *LSJ* 573). Collins 1983b: 403 emends the text to read ἐν σηκῷ ("in its shrine").

²⁷⁹ In vv. 423–425 the eschatological redeemer builds the eschatological temple, while in vv. 433–434 God is the creator of the temple. Lee 2001: 202–3 discusses the tradition that God builds the eschatological temple, while Gaston 1970: 148 suggests that vv. 432–433 identify the eschatological redeemer with God. Chester 1991: 50 argues that it is not a case of identification, but of God acting through the redeemer figure. For temple building by a messianic figure see 2 Sam 7:13; Isa 45:1, 13; Zech 6:12–13. Lee argues that while this "follows the biblical tradition" it is here for political reasons; the messianic figure is a counterfoil for the eschatological enemy, Nero. For God building the eschatological temple see Tob. 14:5–6; 1 En. 90:28–29; Jub. 1:15–17; Pss. Sol. 17:21–34; 11QTemple XXIX 10; 2 Bar. 32:4; 68:5. In Tg. Zech 6:12; Tg. Isa 53:5 the messiah builds the sanctuary. See also Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61; John 2:19.

²⁸⁰ Collins 1998: 236, 238 notes that in Sib. Or. 5, nothing is beyond this world. Simon 1983: 228 comments that the Fifth Sibyl, like the Third, "cannot conceive of Judaism without Palestine, without Jerusalem, without temple." See also Gäbel 2006: 100.

Conclusion

Like Sib. Or. 4, this book specifically refers to the destruction of the second temple. This contrasts with other works discussed in this chapter that ignore the second temple and treat its destruction as though it was Solomon's temple. Nero is condemned for destroying the temple of God, and the text announces an eschatological redeemer who will destroy Nero and all the enemies of God's people. He will also rebuild the temple in a new Jerusalem of gigantic proportions, where the cult will be restored and all the nations come to Jerusalem to worship.

Hebrews predates the destruction of the temple, nevertheless, there the temple and cult point to the eschatological things God had recently accomplished in the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God (1:6; 2:5). In contrast to Sib. Or. 5, Hebrews does not anticipate an eschatological temple in Jerusalem. Temple imagery is transferred to the heavenly world. The eschatological temple is "the true tent which God has pitched" (8:2), inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God. Thus, what this sibyllist sees as a renewed earthly city and temple appears in Hebrews as the heavenly, eschatological temple, with the arrival of the eschaton signalled by the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God.

The Ladder of Jacob

The Ladder of Jacob (Lad. Jac.) is known only from what has survived in the *Tolkovaya Palaya*, a collection of Slavonic "expansions and elaborations of the biblical text."²⁸¹ It retells the story of Jacob's dream at Bethel. Behind the Slavonic version there is probably a Greek version and perhaps a Hebrew or Aramaic original.²⁸² The date and provenance are unknown, although Kugel

281 Kugel 1997: 584. There are seventeen manuscripts dating from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, comprising various sources dating back to the ninth century, see Lunt 1985: 402–3.

282 Lunt 1985: 403 argues for a Greek original on the basis of the use of the Slavonic word "lice," apparently normally used with the sense of "face," for "image" in Lad. Jac. 1:5–7; 5:2. He suggests that this word probably renders πρόσωπον ("face"), in the sense of "bust" or "portrait" (see *LSJ* 1533, s.v. πρόσωπον III, 1), a sense that he argues has no Semitic parallel. He also argues from the presence of Hebrew words in 2:18–19 for "an originally Jewish text written down in Greek but intended for readers with at least some knowledge of Hebrew." On the other hand, Kugel 1995: 209; 2006: 24, 227, followed by Orlov 2004a: 60, proposes that the linguistic connections between Lad. Jac. and rabbinic exegetical traditions concerning the image of Jacob in heaven "do not preclude an original Greek

argues that material in Lad. Jac. 5, referring to the destruction of the temple, was added after the events of 68–70 CE, and consequently the original text must predate those events.²⁸³ Given the state of the text and the uncertainties surrounding its provenance, care must be taken in drawing any fixed conclusions.²⁸⁴

Jacob's vision in Lad. Jac. 1 involves twenty-four human faces, one on each side of the twelve steps of the ladder, and the image of a terrifying face at the top of the ladder, an early indication of the later traditions about the figure of Jacob engraved on the divine throne in heaven.²⁸⁵ In Lad. Jac. 2 Jacob prays for an interpretation of his dream, and in chapter 3 he hears Sariel being instructed to interpret the dream.²⁸⁶ In chapter 4 Sariel changes Jacob's name to Israel ("similar to my name"—Sariel), and in chapter 5 Sariel interprets the dream as a brief review of the history of Jacob's descendants. Thus, for Lad. Jac. 5, the dream is "some sort of symbolic message about the future."²⁸⁷

The twelve steps and twenty-four human faces reappear in 5:1. The twelve steps are twelve ages, and the twenty-four human faces are twenty-four rulers

composition . . . but make that possibility somewhat less likely." I refer below to several places in the text that seem to presuppose a Semitic original.

283 Kugel 1995: 221–24; 2006: 27–33 argues that the interpretation of the dream in 5:7–15 bears little relationship to the details of the dream in chapter 1, and is a post-70 CE interpolation into a much earlier text, perhaps predating the Maccabean period. He also acknowledges that the absence of any reference to Lad. Jac. elsewhere in the literature of Second Temple Judaism makes this early date problematical and eventually settles on a date in the first half of the first century CE. This interpolation theory is not germane to the present study, nor is the precise date of the work. Lad. Jac. 5:7–15 seems to post-date the destruction of the temple so I include it in this chapter as another response to that event. Bauckham 2001: 160–61 proposes a date after 70 CE, around the same time as Apoc. Ab. Orlov 2004a: 60 proposes a date in the first century CE. The seventh chapter is a much later Christian addition to what was originally a Jewish text (Lunt 1985: 404–5; Kugel 1995: 227; Orlov 2004a: 60).

284 Lunt 1985: 401.

285 For these traditions see the Targums on Gen 28:12, esp. Tg. Ps.-J.; Tg. Neof.; and the Frg. Tg. For these three Targums in parallel columns in English see Rowland 1984: 501–2, and Fossum 1995: 138. For a similar tradition see Pirqe R. El. 45B; Gen. Rab. 68:12; 78:3; Num. Rab. 4:1; and b. Hul. 91b.

286 For the role and identity of Sariel see Milik 1976: 172–74; Orlov 2004a: 71–73.

287 Kugel 1995: 211; 2006: 19–24. Philo, *Somn.* 1. 150, 153–156 also reads Jacob's dream as some sort of preview of the future.

of ungodly nations,²⁸⁸ who will rise up to test Jacob's descendants.²⁸⁹ In 5:6 these rulers will rise up because of the iniquity of Jacob's grandsons,²⁹⁰ and "this place" (Jerusalem)²⁹¹ will be made desolate by "four ascents." The precise referent of the "four ascents" is unclear,²⁹² but it leads the text into a discussion of the building of the temple and its subsequent destruction and desolation until the fourth descent of the age.²⁹³ The following verses read "upon the property of your forefathers a palace will be built, a temple in the name of your God and your fathers' [God], but in anger against your children it will be made deserted, until the fourth descent of this age."

The text continues, referring to oppression by the descendants of Esau (a cipher for Rome),²⁹⁴ whom God will raise up to punish his people. While their ability to do so is limited by God, ultimately they will do more evil than any other opposing power, forcing God's people to serve idols and sacrifice

288 Kugel 1995: 210; 2006: 25, 227–28 reads "lawless nations," i.e. Gentiles.

289 Lunt 1985: 409 uses the word "interrogate" in 5:5, where Kugel 1995: 210; 2006: 25, 228 argues for "test."

290 "Because of" is from Kugel 1995: 211; 2006: 25, 228. Lunt 1985: 409 reads "against" (which is apparently a more accurate rendering of the Slavonic preposition *Ha*). Kugel 2006: 228 (note 24) suggests that the source of the confusion is the Hebrew preposition *בִּלְבָּד*, which can have the sense both of "against" and "because of." This is evidence for a Semitic original as the Greek preposition *διὰ* ("because of," "through," "by means of") nowhere has the sense of "against."

291 Kugel 1995: 216. In the original context of Gen 28, a more likely referent is Bethel, but in the context of Lad. Jac. 5 Jerusalem is meant.

292 These "ascents" do not appear in the account of the dream in 1:1–6, leading Kugel (ibid.: 17–18) to suggest that the interpretation is the conflation of two different traditions, and in support he demonstrates that the text flows smoothly with the elimination of vv. 7–15. There is no MS evidence for this proposal, but the state of the witnesses to the text would probably preclude this. He also suggests (ibid.: 212–15) that the four ascents equate to the four world empires of Dan 3:36–40; 7:3–27, with the angels being the princes of those empires (Dan 10:13, 20). See the midrash on Jacob's dream attributed to R. Samuel b. Nahman (third-fourth century CE), where Media's angel ascends and descends fifty-two times, Greece's one hundred and eighty times, and Rome's continues to ascend. While these connections seem valid, certainty is not possible. For ascending and descending referring to the destiny of nations see Exod. Rab. 32:7; Lev. Rab. 29:2.

293 Ibid.: 215; 2006: 25. Note that Kugel refers to the fourth "descent," while Lunt 1985: 215 refers to four "ascents" of this age. Kugel 1995: 215; 2006: 228 cites MS evidence for descent, but notes that it is difficult to assess the relationship of the different witness with no critical edition of the text available.

294 Kugel 1995: 215; 2006: 27.

to the dead, which some will do.²⁹⁵ The pericope ends with a quotation from Gen 15:13, referring to their slavery in Egypt,²⁹⁶ followed by a note of hope, “the Lord will judge the people for whom they slave” (Lad. Jac. 5:17).

This seems to be a reference to Rome, and while this is quite obscure, the destruction and desolation of the temple seems clear. If it is a valid reading, and if it does refer to Rome’s *descent*, then the text attributes the fall of the temple to the sin and idolatry of Jacob’s descendants. It is their punishment by God through the agency of Rome. This will lead some to even greater idolatry. The text also limits the duration of the temple’s desertion until the fall of the Roman Empire. It ends with the assurance that God will eventually judge Rome.

The text appears to be a response to the fall of the temple, recognising that it was fore-ordained by God as a punishment for idolatry. All this was revealed to Jacob in a dream. The punishment was also limited, for Rome would also finally fall like the empires of Babylon, Media and Greece.²⁹⁷ The dissatisfaction with the temple in this text is not so much with the temple *per se*,²⁹⁸ rather it is a recognition of the wickedness of the people, with God punishing them by striking at the heart of their national and religious life, the temple. The text probably holds the temple in high esteem and mourns its loss.

295 The text is quite obscure, with Lunt 1985: 409 reading “*kḥalkonagargailyuya*.” Kugel 2006: 229 notes that others have seen a reference to some named deity. He posits an original Aramaic text reading פלחון גליליא (*pulchan gillulaya*, “foreign worship”). If correct, this is further evidence for a Semitic original and, in this case, Aramaic.

296 Lad. Jac. 5:16. This quotation bears little relationship to vv 7–15 and the references to Rome, but could conceivably follow on smoothly from v. 6. Kugel 2006: 28 suggests that under Roman domination they were not “exiles in a strange land.” On the other hand, the end of exile was supposed to result in Jewish sovereignty (Acts 1:6), and the Roman domination meant that the exile was in that sense not yet over. If Kugel’s proposals are valid, the editor of the text, understanding that, may have seen no need to modify the placement of this quotation. The text continues, referring to the Exodus and to Edom and Moab (Lad. Jac. 6:1–15), which naturally follows on from the reference to Egypt.

297 Kugel 1995: 216. See also the positive picture painted in Lad. Jac. 6.

298 Jacob’s prayer in Lad. Jac. 2 acknowledges that God is enthroned on a “the fiery throne of glory” surrounded by angelic beings who serve him. The imagery is of God in a heavenly temple, with allusions to Isa 6. There is no suggestion that God is in the earthly temple, but in the literary setting of Gen 28 the temple had not been built.

Josephus

Josephus ben Matthias was born in 37/38 CE and lived until around the turn of the century. He was born and raised in a priestly family in Judea. At the age of twenty-six (64 CE) he went to Rome and successfully secured the release of several priests who had been sent there to be tried by Nero (*Life* 13–16). He returned to Palestine, where in 66/67 he had command of a Jewish garrison in Galilee. At the siege of Jotapata, he surrendered to Vespasian and was held under house arrest in Caesarea. After the destruction of Jerusalem, he accompanied Titus to Rome, where he was given Roman citizenship and a pension under the patronage of Vespasian (*Life* 422–425). From there, he produced his substantial corpus of literature.²⁹⁹

Josephus authored four works: the *Jewish War* (*J.W.*) written in Aramaic soon after the fall of Jerusalem, and translated into Greek between 75–79;³⁰⁰ the *Antiquities of the Jews* (*Ant.*), completed in 93/94 during the reign of Domitian (*Ant.* 20.267); an autobiography (*Life*), usually dated around 100 CE and appended to *Ant.* (*Life* 430); and an apologetic tract, *Against Apion* (*Ag. Ap.*), written in the nineties of the first century.³⁰¹ All of these works post-date the fall of Jerusalem and can be treated as a response to that event, although the most relevant information comes from *J.W.* written to explain the events leading up to and following the sack of Jerusalem.

I will first examine several relevant texts in *Ant.*, which now stands as a prelude to *J.W.* (*Ant.* 20.259). All that Josephus wrote about the temple he wrote in the knowledge that it was no longer standing in Jerusalem. While he had certain things to say about the temple and its destruction, he made no comment on the theological implications of these events. His interests were more with historiography and apologetics than theology.³⁰² However, some places reveal his attitude to the temple.

299 See Nickelsburg 2005: 289–90 for this biographical detail. For detail of the social context of Josephus see Barclay 1996: 246–51. For a fuller summary of his life and works see Schwartz 1990: 1–22; Mason 2003: 34–53.

300 Barclay 1996: 448 notes that there is some debate as to this date and *J.W.* may not have been completed until around 96 CE. See the discussion in Feldman 1984: 839–90. The Aramaic edition is no longer extant.

301 Attridge 1984: 192–93, 210–11; Barclay 1996: 448; Nickelsburg 2005: 290–92.

302 Spilsbury 2001: 242–43.

The Antiquities of the Jews

This work is a history of the Jewish people from Adam until the inception of the Jewish War, although there is some overlap with the later books of *J.W.* where Josephus treats the history of the same period.³⁰³ The first half of the work retells the biblical story, using the Bible as the main source.³⁰⁴ *Antiquities* is a long and detailed history, and I restrict my comments to the treatment of the tabernacle, Solomon's temple, the rebuilt post-exilic temple and Herod's temple-building project. Since Josephus was not an eyewitness to any of these events, his main source is the biblical text (including 1 Maccabees). Evidence of his attitude to the temple will come from the modifications he makes to the text and his interpretive comments.³⁰⁵

The Tabernacle

Josephus deals with the design and construction of the wilderness tabernacle, the priestly garments, and various cultic and other regulations in *Ant.* 3.100–290. He begins with God's wish that a “tent” (σκηνή) should be set up for God to descend to when he came among them, and which they would carry about with them so that they no longer needed to go to Sinai to encounter God (3.100). Rather, God would “frequent” (ἐπιφοιτάω) the tent and “be present” (παρὰτυγχάνω) with them in their prayers. The portable shrine is constructed because God desired it, and in some sense replaces Sinai as the place where God is encountered.³⁰⁶ While the tabernacle is also a place of sacrifice (*Ant.* 2.224–257), as in Exod 25:8, it is primarily the place where God is encountered among his people.

Josephus describes the three parts of the tabernacle in 3.122–125. In 3.125 he calls it a “temple” (ναός), a word that the LXX never uses of the tabernacle. The entire structure is called “a holy place” (ἅγιον), and the “inaccessible” (ἄβατος) “inner chamber” (ἄδυτον) “the holy place of the Holy One” (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ ἁγίου). The parts of the tabernacle have cosmic symbolism similar to that found

303 *J.W.* begins with Antiochus IV, and the actual sack of Jerusalem is not recounted until Book 6. I deal with the descriptions of Herod's temple in *Ant.* 15 and *J.W.* 5 together for convenience.

304 Attridge 1984: 211. At the outset, Josephus refers to “the Hebrew writings” (τὰ ἑβραϊκὰ γράμματα, *Ant.* 1.5), but also to a Greek translation (*Ant.* 1.10). This translation differs from the LXX. See Attridge's discussion of the biblical witnesses used by Josephus in 1976: 30–33; 1984: 211, and for a summary of Josephus' other sources in *Ant.* see 1976: 33–38; 1984: 211–16; Schwartz 1990: 45–57; 223–24.

305 Barclay 1996: 358.

306 In *Ant.* 3.212, 223 Moses no longer goes to Sinai. Rather, he goes to the tabernacle to receive answers to his prayers and instructions as to praxis and laws.

in Philo.³⁰⁷ The innermost part, accessible only to the priests, was “devoted to God like heaven” (ὡς οὐρανὸς ἀνείτο τῷ θεῷ), while the outer parts were “like land and sea, accessible to humans” (ὥσπερ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα βásiμος ἀνθρώποις), although only priests were permitted to enter. Thus, the entire tabernacle was a “representation (μίμησις) of universal nature” (ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, 3.123). These comparisons indicate that the central shrine was analogous to heaven, and the dwelling place of God and the outer courts analogous to the earth and the sea where humans dwell. Notably, language of “representation” or “imitation” (μίμησις) refers to the structure of the universe and not to an imitation of the heavenly temple.

Cosmic symbolism reappears in 3.179–187. Josephus suggests that if the critics of Judaism were to observe the construction of the tabernacle, the priests’ garments and the sacred equipment they would recognise that their lawgiver was a divine man, since in every way these were made “in imitation and representation of the universe” (εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων).³⁰⁸ Again, Josephus describes the tripartite sanctuary as “signifying the land and the sea” (ἡ γῆ καὶ ἡ θάλασσα), accessible to all, while the third part belongs to God, “because heaven is inaccessible to humans” (διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις). The twelve loaves signify the twelve months of the year, the candlestick in seventy parts the planets, and the seven lamps the course of the planets. The veils (φάρσος) woven of four materials signify the four elements: the fine linen signifies the earth; the purple, the sea; the blue, the air; and the red, fire.³⁰⁹

These descriptions are much briefer than those in Philo and appear for apologetic rather than philosophical purposes.³¹⁰ There is no suggestion that

307 While Josephus had access to a considerable library, Attridge 1984: 211 suggests that “[d]ependence on Philo . . . is quite unlikely.” Hayward 1996: 145 and Schwartz 1990: 40–43 also deny dependence on Philo, noting that both writers reflect traditions that existed elsewhere. In particular, he notes Zech 4:10 (esp. the LXX); Heb 8:5; Wis 18:24. Josephus mentions Philo in *Ant.* 18.257–260, noting that he is an eminent man, “not unacquainted with philosophy” (φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἄπειρος).

308 This translation from Feldman 2000: 280.

309 The same scheme appears in Philo *Mos.* 2.84–88, 117–130. Josephus also describes the “tunic” (χιτῶν) of the high priest. The linen signifies the earth, the blue signifies the sky and the pomegranates signify lightning and thunder. The ephod signifies the four elements, the breastplate the earth, the girdle the ocean, the sardonyxes the sun and moon, the twelve stones the twelve months and the blue “turban” (πτῶς), heaven, since it has God’s name inscribed upon the golden crown representing the sunlight.

310 For comparisons with Philo see Daniélou 1957: 83–90; Koester 1989: 60; Hayward 1996: 147–51. Allegory such as is found throughout Philo is absent from Josephus apart from

the tabernacle is a copy of a heavenly temple or sanctuary; rather, it is an “imitation” (ἀπομίμησις) and “configuration” (διατύπωσις) of the universe (3.180). The tabernacle symbolises the universe and is a microcosm of it,³¹¹ with the holy of holies equivalent to “heaven” where God dwells, and the outer courts, “earth and sea,” accessible to humans.

The tabernacle took seven months to complete (3.201),³¹² and God was pleased with the work (3.202). He came and “visited” (ἐπιξενόομαι) with the people, “taking up residence (κατασκηνώ) in this temple” (τῷ ναῷ τούτῳ), as was evidenced by the darkness surrounding the tabernacle, while the “sky” (οὐρανός) was clear, from which flowed “a pleasant dew (ἡδύς . . . δρόσος), revealing the presence of God” (θεοῦ δηλοῦσα παρουσίαν). God was present with his people in the tabernacle, and was encountered there. It had cosmic significance. Josephus has a positive estimate of it, and there is no indication that it is inferior because it is earthly.

Solomon's Temple

In *Ant.* 4.199–201 Moses announces that in one city in the land of Canaan in a most beautiful place, there is to be one temple. There is to be no other temple in any other city, “for God is one and the Hebrew race is one” (θεὸς γὰρ εἷς καὶ τὸ Ἑβραίων γένος ἓν). Although Deut 12 makes no mention of a temple, Josephus here reflects the Deuteronomic prescriptions for the centralisation of worship, adding the temple.³¹³ In 4.313 Moses predicts that if the people disobey God's law then, among other disasters that would befall the people, their temple (ναός) would be burnt, a prediction that does not appear in the OT.³¹⁴ As *Ant.* 7.91 indicates, Josephus read these pronouncements as a prediction that a temple would be built (and subsequently destroyed). He believed that a temple was part of God's design for his people from the beginning and invests “David's project with Mosaic authority.”³¹⁵

these paragraphs that Barclay 1996: 358 (note 48) suggests reflect an older Jewish tradition. In *Ant.* 1.24–25 Josephus refers to the possibility of allegorical meanings and promises to write more about these if God gives him the time. In *J.W.* 4.324–325 he refers to the high priests in “sacred clothing” (ιερά ἐσθής) presiding over “cosmic worship” (κοσμική θρησκεία). See Thackeray's brief discussion of this expression in Josephus 1926–1965: 3: 96–97 (note a); Hayward 1996: 144.

311 Feldman 2006: 109.

312 For details of the calculation see Feldman 2000: 285 (note 531). *Exod. Rab.* 52.2 has six months.

313 *Ibid.*: 400 (note 591).

314 *Ibid.*: 470 (note 1092).

315 Begg 2005: 231 (note 359).

Josephus describes Solomon's temple in *Ant.* 8, relying on the biblical text.³¹⁶ While he emphasises the splendour of the building and its magnitude, its deep foundations and gold overlay, there is no cosmic symbolism. There are two chambers, rather than three (8.71),³¹⁷ and in the "inner house" (ἐνδοθεν οἶκος) twenty cubits each way was the "shrine" (ἄδυτος). The brazen sea is called a sea, not because it represents the sea, but because it was so large (8.79). Solomon spared no cost when he built the temple (8.95). He completed the work in seven years (8.99), which was a relatively short time given its size. Clearly, it was a significant building.

Josephus recounts the dedication of the temple in 8.106–121, again relying to a large extent on the biblical narrative. The presence of God is signified by a "dense cloud" (πύλημα νεφέλης) that appeared and "spread itself into the temple" (εἰς τὸν ναὸν εἰσερρύη). It gave the people the "impression and opinion"³¹⁸ (φαντασία καὶ δόξα) that God had descended to the "temple" (ἱερόν) and "taken up residence" (κατασκηνώ) in it (8.106). When Solomon prays (8.107), he acknowledges that God has "an eternal house" (οἶκος αἰώνιος), which consists of "heaven" (οὐρανός), the "atmosphere" (ἀήρ), the "earth" (γῆ) and the "sea" (θάλασσα), none of which can contain or limit God (8.107). He (Solomon) built a "temple" (ναός) for God, so that when they sacrifice and perform their cultic actions and send their prayers into the "atmosphere" (ἀήρ) they can be persuaded that God "is present" (παρεῖμι) and not "remote" (μακράν) from them, since this is where God "dwells" (οἰκέω).

As in 1 Kings 8 and 2 Chr 6, Josephus recognises that God dwells in heaven, but also in the temple. In his prayer (8.114), Josephus has Solomon asking God to send some portion of his spirit to the temple, so that God would "appear" (δοκέω) to be with them on earth,³¹⁹ even though the heavens themselves are just a "small dwelling place" (μικρόν οἰκητήριον) for God, and "this poor temple" (οὗτος ὁ τυχὼν ναός) of even less significance. Now the grandeur of the building in the previous section is de-emphasised, elevating the importance of God's dwelling place in heaven (1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chr 6:18).

316 Schiffman 2001: 71, 76.

317 Ibid.: 71.

318 This translation from Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 30. In 8.102 Josephus refers to the "human opinion" (κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην δόξαν) that God was taking up residence in the temple. Begg and Spilsbury (ibid.: 29, note 240) suggest that Josephus is dealing with the issue raised by Solomon in his prayer that "God cannot actually be contained in any human-made house." This notion is reflected in the NT in Acts 7:48.

319 This notion reflects 8.102 with its reference to the "human opinion" that God dwelt in the temple. See ibid.: 32 (note 382).

Finally, and ironically given that Josephus knows about and had already written about the destruction of the second temple, Solomon prays that God would guard the temple “as his own” (ὡς ἰδίον) from being “ransacked” (ἀπόρρητος) by enemies, keep it “as the property of his household” (ὡς οἰκείου κτήματος) and care for it “forever” (εἰς ἄπαν). This prayer is absent from 1 Kings 8 and 2 Chr 6, and needs to be seen as background to what Josephus will have to say about the destruction of both Solomon’s temple and the second temple.

In his discussion of the temple, Josephus struggles with the idea of God dwelling in a building constructed by humans, yet acknowledges that it was possible for God to do this (8.108). In some sense, he recognises two dwelling places of God: one on earth and the other encompassing the entire universe (8.107). The worshippers send their prayers “into the air” (εἰς τὸν ἄέρα), but are constantly convinced that “you (God) are present and not far distant” (ὅτι παρὲι καὶ μακρὰν οὐκ ἀφέστηκας). Josephus reflects the ambiguity of Solomon’s prayer, where God dwells in the temple, but hears from heaven. However, in Josephus there is no notion of a heavenly temple, that is, a structure in heaven. He seems to understand the entire universe as God’s temple. God is accessible everywhere, but in the temple in a special way. The temple is not a copy of any heavenly temple.

The Destruction of Solomon’s Temple

The destruction of Solomon’s temple is dealt with quickly and unemotionally, and taken largely from the biblical text (2 Kings 25; 2 Chr 36), which is also brief. In *Ant.* 10.136 the enemies’ commanders entered “the sacred precinct” (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν),³²⁰ and Zedekiah fled out of the city. In 10.144 the king of Babylon sent his official Nebuzaradan to Jerusalem “to sack (συλλάω) the temple” (ναός),³²¹ to burn it, the palace and the city, and to exile the people to Babylon. This he did (10.145), carrying off the cultic vessels and burning the “temple” (ναός) to the ground. The following paragraphs give chronological detail about the day on which the temple was destroyed, the length of time it had been standing, and the elapsed time since the Exodus. A final note in 10.154 records that the cultic vessels from the Jerusalem temple were dedicated to the gods of the king of Babylon. Thus, the Davidic dynasty ends (10.143). City, temple and

³²⁰ This translation from *ibid.*: 250. See Jer 39:3–4.

³²¹ It is difficult to know whether the distinction between ἱερόν (“temple complex”) and ναός (“shrine”), as indicated in e.g. BDAG 470, 665–66 can always be maintained in Josephus. He uses each word more than four hundred times. The holy of holies is called τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν (“the holy temple”) in *J.W.* 5.207.

palace are destroyed, the people exiled and the cultic vessels put to the service of foreign gods.

The Post-Exilic Temple

Antiquities Book 11 recounts the post-exilic rebuilding of the temple. Again, it is a matter-of-fact account. As in Ezra 3:12 and Hag 2:3, there is considerable disappointment at the inferiority of the rebuilt temple, although the people were “very satisfied” (ἄγαπάω) with their lot (11.82),³²² and contented that they were permitted to build the temple. There is no detail as to the architecture of the building or its grandeur, nor is there any indication that this was the dwelling place of God. As in the biblical text, God’s presence, which is symbolised by the cloud, is conspicuous by its absence. Moreover, twice Josephus notes that this temple was more like a “fortress” (φρούριον) than a temple (11.89, 97). This is clearly a different class of building from Solomon’s temple.

Herod’s Temple Building Project

As *Ant.* 15.380–425 indicates, Herod’s temple was a magnificent structure, apparently making up for the deficiencies of the post-exilic temple. At the outset, Herod decides that he would build “the temple of God” (ὁ νεώς τοῦ θεοῦ) with a larger footprint and sixty cubits higher so as to match the height of Solomon’s temple.³²³ The description of the building concludes with a note that the entire “complex” (ιερόν) was built in eight years (15.418–420) and that the “shrine” (ναός) within this, which Herod did not enter because he was not a priest, was built by the priests in one year and six months. Its completion, on the anniversary of Herod’s inauguration, was marked with great rejoicing, and the combined festival was very notable. Josephus also notes that rain was restricted to the hours of darkness, and if anyone was amazed at this they should have regard to the manifestations of God, showing that this was not an incredible circumstance. Clearly, Josephus understood this strange factor as indicating that God was involved in this building project, ensuring that the work was not hindered by inclement weather. Josephus reveals here his positive attitude to Herod’s temple, as a building project ordained by God.

In *J.W.* 5.184–236 Josephus gives a further description of Herod’s temple. He comments on the different parts of the temple, and the allegorical readings of the various parts of the wilderness tabernacle resurface. In 5.207

322 For this sense of ἄγαπάω see BDAG 5–6, s.v. ἄγαπάω 2.

323 Schiffman 2001: 76–77. For νεώς as “temple” see 2 Macc 4:14; 6:2; 9:16; 10:3, 6. νεώς is an attic form of ναός, see BDF 25, §44 (1).

“the shrine itself (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ναός) situated in the centre” (κατὰ μέσον κείμενος), that is, “the holy temple” (τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν) was separated from the outer courts by an “entrance” (πύλη) that had no doors. Thus, the broad expanse of “heaven” (οὐρανός) was displayed, unexcluded. This part of the temple symbolises heaven. However, within this is a “veil” (καταπέτασμα), with multi-coloured embroidery, symbolising an “image of the universe” (εἰκὼν τῶν ὅλων), details of which are elaborated in 5.213–214, with the same schema as for the tabernacle. The lamp stand with seven lamps symbolises the seven planets, the twelve loaves the circle of the Zodiac and the year, and the “altar” (θυμιατήριον) and its thirteen spices communicate that both the “uninhabited” (ἀόικητος) and “inhabited” (οἰκουμένη) world are of God and for God. On the other side of the veil was an “inaccessible” (ἄβατος) compartment, “undefiled” (ἄχραντος) and “invisible” (ἀθέατος) to all people, called “the holy place of the Holy One” (ἁγίου δὲ ἁγίου, 5.219).

Josephus deals with the high priest’s garments in *J.W.* 5.231–235, with brief notes on the symbolism of the bells (thunder) and the pomegranates (lightning). He notes that the colours of the garments are the same as the colours of the veil, promising to give more detail at another time (5.237).

The impact of these descriptions and their absence from the description of Solomon’s temple and the rebuilt post-exilic temple demonstrate that Josephus believed that this enlarged and beautified temple took the people and cult back to the pristine times of the wilderness tabernacle. Along with the remarkable circumstances of its construction, these details show that this temple was ordained by God, as his dwelling place with his people.³²⁴ The positive attitude to the temple is probably for apologetic purposes, as Josephus commends the Jewish religion to his Roman patron.³²⁵

The Jewish War

This is the earliest of Josephus’s works, written from Rome in the aftermath of the sack of Jerusalem. It was originally composed in Aramaic for the people of Parthia and Babylon (*J.W.* 1.3). It was later translated into Greek for a Roman

324 That Josephus understood that God was encountered in Jerusalem and in the temple can be deduced from *J.W.* 5.380 where, long before any temple was built, Abraham is said to have lifted up his hands to the temple site to seek help from God. The temple site is described as the place which “you (the Jews) have now polluted” (εἰς ὃν νῦν ἐμίανατε χώρον ὑμεῖς). On this see Spilsbury 2001: 253.

325 It probably also reflects the fact that Herod was installed by the Romans, and Josephus is reporting on his prowess as a temple builder.

audience, to correct the distortion in other accounts due to either hatred for the Jews or flattery of the Romans (1.2). Thus, Josephus claims to be writing an unbiased account of the war from the perspective of an eyewitness who can speak for both sides.³²⁶ He begins with a history of the Jews from Antiochus (c. 175 BCE) to the death of Herod the Great (4 BCE). Book 2 moves quickly to an account of the events leading up to the war and books 3–6 detail the course of the war itself. Book 7 recounts the aftermath of the war, including the triumphant arrival of Vespasian in Rome, with the spoils from the temple.

While Josephus claims impartiality, this work will eventually become an official history of the events for the emperor (*Life* 363). He cannot be too critical of Rome. Moreover, he has a positive view of the temple and does not hide his emotions at its destruction (*J.W.* 1.9–12; 6.111). Ultimately, he absolves Rome from blame for the destruction, representing Rome as an unwilling participant in events that can be attributed to certain culpable elements within Jewish society, and ultimately ordained by God.³²⁷

The culpable elements within Jewish society are also apparent in *Ant.* 20.164–166. Certain “insurrectionists” (λῃσταί) entered Jerusalem and killed the high priest Jonathan, whose murder was never avenged. They then mingled with other worshippers with hidden weapons, even committing murder in the temple. This, says Josephus, seems to be the reason why God rejected “our city” (ἡμῶν ἡ πόλις), and no longer judges the “temple” (ἱερόν) to be pure enough to be his “dwelling place” (οἰκητήριον).³²⁸ Consequently, God brought the Romans to purify the city and enslave the people, so as to make them wiser by their

326 Marguerat 2007: 327.

327 Barclay 1996: 352–53. Leoni 2007: 39–51 concludes that in his account of the destruction of the temple Josephus is “substantially trustworthy,” but while Barclay 1996: 351 argues that *J.W.* is too complex to be dismissed as “imperial propaganda,” he also suggests (p. 353) that the way Josephus absolves Titus from blame is “‘economical with the truth’ and possibly a complete fabrication.” Levine 1994: 233–46 argues for the “basic integrity of Josephus as a historian of first-century Jerusalem,” as do Schürer, Vermes, Millar and Goodman 1973–1987: 1: 506–7 (note 115).

328 This repeats an earlier pattern reported in *Ant.* 11.299–300 where the high priest Johanan kills his brother in Solomon’s temple. God was not indifferent to this, and Josephus attributes the defilement of the temple by the Persians to it. This attitude to the temple would have been at variance with the attitudes of many Jews, whose issue with the temple would have been that it was built by Herod, who could not have been seen as the proper successor of Solomon. See Wright 1992: 225–26.

misfortune. The destruction of the temple is attributed not to any failure of the temple or the priesthood,³²⁹ but to the actions of the insurrectionists.³³⁰

Contrasting with the culpability of the Jewish revolutionaries, the Romans, and especially Titus, appear in a favourable light. When the city is burning and the temple gates alight, Titus expresses his reluctance to burn the temple (*J.W.* 6.241), despatching chosen men to quench the fire (6.243). A recalcitrant soldier throws a firebrand through a window under some “supernatural impulse” (δαίμόνιος ὄρμη, 6.252). While Titus and his men try to quench the fire they are ultimately unable to do so (6.260–266), thus, it was burned “against Caesar’s wishes” (ἄκοντος Καίσαρος).³³¹

The reference to a “supernatural impulse” raises the question of a theological reason for the destruction of the temple.³³² God seems to have decreed that Israel’s enemy (Rome) should be the instrument of his punishment.³³³ This is made clear by a series of events that Josephus attributes to God. In *J.W.* 2.539 God hinders Cestius from ending the war; in 4.104 Josephus attributes the escape of John of Gischala from Titus to the action of God, who saved him for the sake of the destruction of Jerusalem;³³⁴ and in 4.288–299 the Zealots sleep and the Idumeans enter the city, an event not attributed to their laziness, but to the overruling decree of “Destiny” (μείρομαι, 4.297),³³⁵ and moreover, there

329 In *J.W.* 6.94–97, 100–102 John of Gischala is said to have suspended the perpetual sacrifice, and bears some responsibility, although he was a rogue, and not representative of an ideal priest. See Marguerat 2007: 327.

330 Rajak 1983: 80–95; Attridge 1984: 195; Barclay 1996: 352; Marguerat 2007: 327–28. The word ληστής (“insurrectionist,” “brigand,” “robber”) appears seventy-six times in Josephus, but only once in the first half of *Ant* (9.183). It appears thirty-eight times in *J.W.*, four times in *Ant.* 14, eleven times in *Ant.* 11 and fourteen times in *Ant.* 20, all of which cover the same historical period as *J.W.* It also appears eight times in *Life*. Such statistics need to be read with care, but could indicate that Jewish insurrection is a major theme in Josephus’ account of the period of Roman domination of Palestine. For other examples see *J.W.* 2.316–342, 414, where the high priest implores the people not to take up arms.

331 Attridge 1984: 203 suggests that “the Jewish revolutionaries were wicked and the Roman conquerors . . . not only brave, but blameless in their conquest of the city.”

332 On this see *ibid.*: 203–6.

333 Marguerat 2007: 328–29. See *Is* 45:1–8; *Jer* 20:1–6.

334 John encouraged the people of Gischala to rebel against Titus. When Titus marched upon Gischala, John convinced him not to attack the city since it was the Sabbath, although he was more concerned to save his own skin. Titus, who seems to have been taken in, withdrew. John took advantage of this and fled to Jerusalem, ultimately becoming leader of the Zealot rebellion against Rome. See *J.W.* 4.84–223. See also Schwartz 1990: 85.

335 Attridge 1984: 204 capitalises “Destiny,” and reads this expression as “the inexorable will of the God worshipped in the Temple at Jerusalem.”

was also a storm so that nobody heard anything (298–299). God’s involvement in the destruction of the city and the temple is even clearer in 4.323, where Josephus says that God had “condemned (κατακρίνω) the city for its pollutions” (ὡς μεμιασμένης τῆς πόλεως) and resolved to “purge” (ἐκκαθαίρω) “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) by fire. Finally, and most significantly, Josephus claims that God had gone over to the Romans.³³⁶ This is expressed in speeches by Agrippa (2.390), by Titus (3.484; 6.38–39); and by Josephus himself, first when he surrenders at Jotapata (3.354) and later (5.367–419; 6.110–111).³³⁷

For Josephus, then, city and temple are destroyed because God was on the side of the blameless Romans and against the rebellious Jews. There is little of the dismay encountered in 2 Baruch (although Josephus does not hide his emotions); little of the distress encountered in 3 Baruch and 4 Ezra, and the cause is not idolatry as in Apoc. Ab. Nor are the Romans castigated for their part in the destruction as in Sib. Or., and nowhere does Josephus anticipate an eschatological temple to be built by God.³³⁸ Rather, God is judging his people for their rebellion, and the God of the Jews is now the God of the Romans. To all intents and purposes, this central symbol of Jewishness has gone.

Against Apion

Against Apion is an apologetic work, written to refute criticism of the *Antiquities* on the basis that the five thousand years of Jewish history appears nowhere else and cannot be true (*Ag. Ap.* 1.1–2).³³⁹ The title is somewhat of a misnomer, since Apion is only one of those addressed, with numerous other opponents, both named and unnamed.³⁴⁰ Parts are extant in Greek and parts in Latin.

Josephus describes the temple in *Ag. Ap.* 2.102–111.³⁴¹ It is surrounded by four courts, each one with a higher degree of sanctity.³⁴² The outer court was open to anyone, even foreigners, women were permitted in the second court, Jewish men in the third, and the priests, when clothed in their priestly regalia, in the fourth. In addition, there was “the most sacred place” (*adytum*), which was accessible only to the high priest clad in specific regalia. The schema reflects the increasing levels of holiness within the temple.³⁴³ Moreover, the priests

336 Spilsbury 2002: 312–14; Marguerat 2007: 327–31.

337 Attridge 1984: 194–95 notes the significance of the speeches in *J.W.* as “important for illustrating the tendencies of Josephus’ work.” He places such speeches in his own mouth and the mouths of significant actors in the drama.

338 Nickelsburg 2005: 291.

339 Josephus also appears to have been stung by criticism of *J.W.*, see *Ag. Ap.* 1.47–56.

340 Nickelsburg 2005: 294.

341 For the background to this section see Bauckham 1996: 128.

342 Barclay 2007: 222–23.

343 For similar restrictions see *J.W.* 5.227.

only enter at certain times, and no vessels are permitted to be carried through the temple. If Apion had taken the time to make himself aware of such things he would not have uttered such incredible words as he did. Indeed, Apion betrays no knowledge of “the purity of our temple” (*templi nostri pietatem*).

In 2.193 Josephus refers to “one temple of the one God” (εἷς ναὸς ἑνὸς θεοῦ), and then proposes that it should be “common to all” (κοινὸς ἀπάντων), since “God is common to all” (κοινοῦ θεοῦ ἀπάντων). The priests are to be occupied with their sacrificial work, and the offerings are not so as to overindulge themselves, for excess is against the will of God (194–195), and when they make sacrifices they are to pray, first for the common welfare of all people and then for their own.

Since Josephus is discussing Judaism, he probably refers here to a single temple for the nation,³⁴⁴ but since he had earlier spoken of the outer court for foreigners, this paragraph may also reflect a universalistic outlook.³⁴⁵ Moreover, while the temple has by this time been in ruins for twenty-five years, he describes the regulations about access and the cult in the present tense, indicating that while God had gone over to the Romans, this was not the end of the Jewish religion.³⁴⁶ Either it was difficult for him to imagine the religion without its ritual or else, like his contemporaries, he anticipated the rebuilding of the temple sometime in the future.³⁴⁷ However, Josephus never discusses a rebuilt temple, and there is no hint of an eschatological temple.

Conclusion

All the texts discussed in this chapter post-date the destruction of the Second Temple, but apart from Sib. Or. 5 and Josephus, they all conceal their references to its destruction under the guise of the destruction of Solomon’s temple. Also, apart from these two texts the second temple is by and large overlooked, only appearing in 2 Bar. 32:3; 68:5, as something far off in the future, that will be built “for a time” and “not as fully as before.” Where these texts anticipate a

344 See *Ant.* 4.199–201.

345 Hayward 1996: 152; Barclay 2007: 279–80 (note 771). In *Ag. Ap.* 2.76–77 sacrifices are offered for the emperors and the people of Rome.

346 Bauckham 1996: 347 suggests that the present tense indicates that “Josephus, even when he wrote *CA*, could not envisage Judaism without the ministry of the priests in the temple at its heart.”

347 Barclay 2007: 279 (note 769). In *Ant.* 4.314 Moses predicts the frequent destruction and rebuilding of the temple. The Mishnah, likewise, seems to have anticipated the rebuilding of the temple and the restoration of the cult (m. Mid. 1.1), as did Barnabas (Barn. 16:3–4).

restored, rebuilt temple, it is the eschatological temple. While the narrative settings of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch and 3 Baruch demand references to Solomon's temple, the setting of Sib. Or. 5, with its references to Nero, demands a reference to the second temple. The reviews of history in Apoc. Ab., LAB, and Lad. Jac. could have included the second temple, but they all ignore it. It seems that, to these writers, the real temple, in which the glory of YHWH dwelt, was Solomon's and its destruction was a great disaster. The destruction of the second temple, while deeply significant to be sure, paled in comparison with the destruction of Solomon's temple. Moreover, those events could be pinned on sin and idolatry as the OT prophets had said, while this may not have been the case for the second temple, which was destroyed by the occupying forces of Rome. On the other hand, the Egyptian provenance of Sib. Or. 5 is significant. As noted above in Chapter 2, texts emanating from Egypt express a positive attitude to the second temple, and this positive attitude is reflected in a text that takes its destruction more seriously than texts with a Palestinian provenance.³⁴⁸

Josephus is different. He has a positive opinion of the temple, as also the tabernacle and Solomon's temple and, as in Philo, they have cosmic significance. Both Solomon's temple and the second temple were destroyed not because they were inadequate, but because of the recalcitrance of the people. Ultimately, God had gone over to the side of the Romans.

To the extent that the tabernacle appears, references are always positive and it is nowhere denigrated because it is built by humans. It was built as directed by God and, like Solomon's temple, has cosmic significance. It is nowhere presented as an inferior copy of the heavenly temple.

The anticipation of a rebuilt temple in some of these texts is also significant for this study. While it is sometimes seen as an eschatological temple to be built by God, elsewhere it seems to be more like Solomon's temple. Texts where this is the case look back to the pristine days of Solomon's temple and project them forward to the eschaton. Hebrews presents a quite different scenario. The eschatological dwelling of God is the eschatological temple, now come with the exaltation of Christ. While the temple was still standing when Hebrews was written, its fall when it came would simply underscore the reality already understood: "here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come" (Heb 13:14).³⁴⁹

348 Neusner 1975: 35 suggests that "for large numbers of ordinary Jews outside of Palestine, as well as substantial numbers within, the Temple was a remote and, if holy, unimportant place." While this may have been true for some, it was apparently not true for the authors of the texts discussed in this chapter.

349 Neusner (ibid. 35) also suggests that "for the Christian Jews, who were indifferent to the Temple cult . . . the year 70 cannot be said to have marked an important change."

PART 2

Temple Symbolism in Hebrews



Introduction to Part 2

Having surveyed attitudes to the temple in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, I turn now to Hebrews, another Second Temple Jewish(-Christian) text, to consider the attitude to the temple reflected there. In the Introduction (chapter 1, above) I argued from Heb 10:1–4, 11–12 that Hebrews was written while the temple was still standing, and I also suggested that while Hebrews does not explicitly refer to the temple, the temple lies just beneath the surface. Before moving to my treatment of Hebrews I will briefly set out my arguments for this, building a cumulative case that early readers of Hebrews would have read it as referring to, and mounting a critique of, the contemporary priesthood and temple.¹

A Contemporary Priesthood

I begin with the term ἄρχιερεύς (“high priest”) in Hebrews. In the NT this term is restricted to the Gospels and Acts and Hebrews. In total it appears 122 times, referring to members of the contemporary priesthood in the Gospels and Acts, and to Jesus and the Jewish High Priests in Hebrews.² It is rare in the LXX, appearing only forty-four times, mostly in 1 Esdras and 1–4 Maccabees.³ It appears just once in the Pentateuch (Lev 4:3, referring to “the anointed priest,” הכהן המשיח) and twice in Joshua (22:13, 33 referring to Phineas). It is a

1 In what follows, I deal with two texts where I argue for this reading, Heb 7:5, 20, 23 and Heb 8:3–5. I refer to other texts that can be read in the same way in my exegetical treatment in the chapters that follow. An earlier version of the following paragraphs appears in Church 2013b: 114–22. There I build on and develop the arguments of Walker 1994: 39–71 and Motyer 2004: 180–89. Motyer examines Heb 3:1–6; 4:14; 6:19–20; 7:13; 8:1–6, 11; 9:1–14; 10:11–14; 13:13–14, and finds that in each of these texts “the Temple appears in disguise, lurking under the surface as an implicit referent within the wider argument.” Walker concentrates on Heb 13:9–14, which he elsewhere notes, “would mean nothing unless [the author of Hebrews] was thinking about the Jerusalem Temple . . . [a]ny other interpretation reduces the author’s concerns to the level of vague abstractions” (Walker 1996: 206).

2 Ἀρχιερεύς refers to Jesus in Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, 15; 5:5, 10; 6:20; 7:26; 8:1; 9:11, and to the Jewish high priests in 5:1; 7:27, 28; 8:3; 9:7, 25; 13:11. Hebrews 10:21 refers to Jesus as a “great priest” (ἱερεύς μέγας), an expression that occurs just six times in the LXX (Num 35:28; 4 Kgdms 22:4; 2 Chr 34:9; Hag 1:1; 2:2; Zech 3:1. Overwhelmingly, the OT word for the priesthood is the simple word ἱερεύς with no qualifier, appearing 329 times in the Pentateuch alone.

3 See my discussion of ἄρχιερεύς in footnote 32 to Chapter 8 (below).

distinctly “Second Temple” word. If the author was basing his arguments about priesthood from the Torah as scholars often maintain, then his use of ἀρχιερεύς is unexpected. It would be expected, however, if he was comparing Jesus to the contemporary high priests.

Given this, it is instructive to consider some of the places in Hebrews where the Jewish priests appear. Hebrews 7 is one such text. It compares the Levitical priesthood with priesthood like that of Melchizedek, although it uses the term ἱερεύς rather than ἀρχιερεύς. This chapter sometimes refers to the Levitical priesthood in the present tense in ways that the first readers of Hebrews would have read with reference to their contemporaries in the temple. For example, Heb 7:5 claims that that “those from the descendants of Levi” (οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευί) who “receive” (λαμβάνοντες, present participle) the priesthood “have” (ἔχουσιν, present indicative) a regulation empowering them to collect a tenth from their contemporaries. The present tenses could refer to priests from at any time, including contemporary priests, to whom this regulation still applied.⁴

I have translated the expression ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευί as a partitive genitive, although scholars debate its precise force. Blass, Debrunner and Funk, hesitatingly, suggest this reading, as do several other scholars, some of whom refer to contemporary practice.⁵ However, while Ellingworth refers to the priesthood contemporary with Hebrews, he denies any reference to this priesthood:

not all the descendants of Levi were priests. This was certainly the case by the first century AD, and the distinction between priests and levites may already be foreshadowed in Nu. 18:28; cf. Ne. 10:38. But the distinction is far from clear in the Pentateuch, the record of the period of Israel’s history which was normative for the author of Hebrews.⁶

Ellingworth ultimately identifies the genitive as derivative (“those who, as members of Levi’s family, take priestly office”), although it is unclear if he does so because he supposes that the author is thinking of the regulations in the

4 Lane 1991a: 168; Cockerill 2012: 309.

5 BDF 90, para. 164 (1); Hughes 1977: 152; Bruce 1990: 163; Attridge 1989: 195; Koester 2001: 344; Mitchell 2007: 140; Cockerill 2012: 295.

6 Ellingworth 1993: 362. Cf. Attridge 1989: 195, note. 121, who suggests a distinction between “priests and non-priestly levites.” Bruce 1990: 163 also notes that contemporary practice may have led to the author making such a distinction, but “in general his description of the laws relating to the priesthood and sanctuary is based on the Pentateuch and not on contemporary custom.”

Torah rather than of his contemporaries in the temple.⁷ I question, however, the assumption that the pentateuchal period was normative for the author of Hebrews, and I question whether the implied readers of Hebrews would have drawn such a distinction. If they were attracted to the temple and its ritual as Walker and Motyer have argued,⁸ the contemporary priesthood would have come to mind, especially since the regulations about tithing were still in force.⁹

Hebrews 7:20 and 23 are similar. Both verses contain periphrastic perfects with the present tense of εἰμί and the perfect participle of γίνομαι (εἰσὶν . . . γεγονότες) to refer to “those who have become priests.”¹⁰ Hebrews 7:20 refers to those who have become priests without an oath, and 7:23 to the numerous Levitical priests, numerous because they are prevented by death from continuing in office. As O’Brien notes, this text can encompass the entire succession of priests from Aaron to the fall of the temple.¹¹ In both cases, people attracted to the existing priesthood would think of their contemporaries in the Jerusalem temple.

The NRSV of Heb 7:23 obscures any reference to contemporary priests, reading, “the former priests were many in number because they were prevented by death from continuing in office.” The Greek text has no word for “former” and “were prevented by death” is a present passive (διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ καλύεσθαι). This text describes any priests in any era, and there is nothing to restrict the reference to “former” priests.¹² Contemporary priests in the temple cannot be excluded from this text either, and again, first century readers, attracted to the temple and the priesthood could be expected to think of their contemporaries.

7 Ellingworth 1993: 362. Ellingworth follows Westcott 1892: 175–76. See also Cockerill 2012: 308 (note. 56).

8 Walker 1994: 39–71; Motyer 2004: 180–89. I argue for this reading in my treatment of Heb 13:10–16 in chapter 7 (below).

9 For the legal provision see Num 18:21–24, and for its application in the First Century see Josephus, *Life*, 80; *Ant*, 20.181, 206–207.

10 This construction has the same semantic force as the perfect indicative, see Porter 1993: 251–59; McKay 1994: 9. Recent research into the perfect tense has shown, the “present results of a past action” understanding is inadequate (see Porter 1994b: 40; Campbell 2007: 184–210; 2008b: 36; 2011: 139–55), so it is tenuous to argue as Ellingworth 1993: 389–90 does that this construction implies that “the old priesthood is still in existence.” But they cannot for that reason be excluded.

11 O’Brien 2010: 272.

12 Porter 1994a: 307 claims that it is clear that the priesthood in Jerusalem at the time of writing is not in view, although he does not say why. Perhaps he is thinking of those who had died. But if the temple was still standing and the cultus still functional, there is no reason to exclude the descendants of those who had died in the past.

The Contemporary Temple

Not only are the first readers of Hebrews likely to think of priests functioning in the temple, they are also likely to think of the temple in Heb 8:3–5.¹³ Hebrews 8:3–4 refer to the appointment of “every high priest” (Πᾶς . . . ἀρχιερεύς). That the high priests in the Jerusalem temple are in view is clear in verse 4: Jesus would not be a priest “if he was on earth” (εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς), “since there are those who offer” (ὄντων τῶν προσφερόντων) gifts according to the law. This is a “contrary to fact” condition, a construction that normally uses the imperfect tense to refer to the present time from the author’s perspective.¹⁴ Sometimes the imperfect refers to past time,¹⁵ however, in this context, Christ is understood to be enthroned at the right hand of God *now*,¹⁶ and not *now* on earth. Moreover, if verse 4 were to be translated with a past time reference (cf. Lane—“if he had been on earth”) it would raise the question of whether Christ had *ever* been on earth.¹⁷ Thus, a present time reference to the priesthood of Christ best suits the context, with the implication that the rest of the verse also refers to the present time—the high priests who offer the gifts according to the law are officiating in the temple in the present.¹⁸

While Hebrews nowhere explicitly refers to the Second Temple, it does seem likely that the first readers would draw the required inferences. Consequently, in his “word of exhortation” (13:22), the author encourages his people to leave behind their former allegiance to temple and priesthood and follow Jesus. They are to persevere until they attain to God’s rest, which I will argue in chapter 7,

13 I deal with Heb 8:1–13 in chapter 8 (below) and I defer the discussion of Heb 8:5 until then.

14 Wallace 1996: 695.

15 See perhaps John 5:46; Heb 8:7. Ellingworth 1993: 405 suggests (following BDF 360) that the imperfect is “temporally ambiguous.” Porter 1994b: 260–61 points out that the construction need not have “any temporal relation to the referential world.”

16 Johnson 2006: 200; Cf. Koester 2001: 377, “if he were on earth (but he is not), he would not be a priest (although in fact he is a priest).”

17 Ellingworth 1993: 405. See Lane 1991a: 199, and NEB.

18 Gordon 2000: 31–32. Attridge 1989: 219; Ellingworth 1993: 405 and Koester 2001: 37 argue that the present participle προσφερόντων describing the ministry of these priests says nothing about whether the priests were still functioning. This is technically correct, but is not the only consideration. The text discusses the present situation of Christ, and compares this with the service of the Levitical priests. Gieschen 1997: 364–79, esp. 373–74 lists Heb 8:4 along with 9:6–10; 10:1–4; 13:10 as implying “contemporary sacrificial cult activity.” In his popular commentary, Wright 2003: 81–85 discusses the temple rather than the tabernacle in connection with Heb 8:1–5, and Fuller Dow 2010: 172–73 suggests that Heb 8:5 implies that the Jerusalem temple is “just a shadow of the real temple.”

is the eschatological temple that God was expected to build in the last days. While this is an expectation for the future in a number of texts in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the author of Hebrews considers it to be already in place with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God in the heavenly holy of holies. I will argue in the following chapters, then, that for these readers to revert to the temple and its sacrifices now that the heavenly things are in place with the exaltation of Christ, is for them to be occupied with the anticipatory symbols rather than the reality to which they point.

My discussion of Hebrews encompasses three chapters. In chapter 6, I discuss the eschatological orientation of Hebrews reflected in Heb 1–2 and in chapter 7, I discuss texts that deal with the access of the readers to the heavenly temple as their ultimate goal in Heb 3–4; 10–13. I argue that they have this access proleptically in the present and anticipate it in the future. Having dealt with the eschatological orientation of the book, and the eschatological implications of the temple symbolism for the readers, I turn in chapter 8 to discuss the heavenly temple in the central section of Hebrews (4:14–10:18 and especially 8:1–10:18). I argue that heavenly temple language in this part of Hebrews refers to the same realities referred to in 3:1–4:13 and 10:19–13:25. It is figurative language, symbolising the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. The heavenly world is the world to come, where Jesus the exalted Son of God is now enthroned, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, to which these people have access in the present, and where God will ultimately dwell with his people.

The Eschatological Orientation of Hebrews

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine Heb 1–2, which sets the context in which the remainder of the book is to be read. I will argue from Heb 1 that the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God signals the arrival of the eschaton. He has been exalted in the world to come, which has come into the present. Just as Ps 110:1 envisaged the Davidic monarch as God’s vicegerent ruling alongside God with the power and authority of God, Heb 1 envisages Jesus ruling alongside God in the world to come, with the same power and authority. Then I will argue from Heb 2 that the exaltation of Jesus anticipates the restoration of God’s intentions for humanity, the “siblings” (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus.

The Exaltation of the Son (Heb 1:1–14)

In an allusion to Ps 110:1, Heb 1:1–4 claims that “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) God has spoken through a Son who has been exalted to God’s right hand. He obtained a name superior to angelic names, with the superiority of his name the measure of his superiority over the angels. In 1:5–14, a catena of OT quotations establishes this superiority from the text of Scripture. Three pericopes grow out of this treatment of angels. Hebrews 2:1–4 is a brief exhortation to pay close attention to God’s speech through the Son, and Heb 2:5–10 shows from Ps 8 that the exaltation of the Son of God to this position of supreme authority anticipates the ultimate rule of humanity over the world to come. The final part of the chapter contains the final reference to angels (2:10–18), showing that the reason why Jesus became human was because he came to help not angels but humans, the descendants of Abraham

This first major section of Hebrews can be structured as follows:

- 1:1–4 Introduction: God has spoken in these last days through a Son who has sat down at God’s right hand.¹

1 Several scholars detect a pre-existing liturgical fragment in these verses. See Bornkamm 1959: 197–98; Deichgräber 1967:137–140; Sanders 1971:19–20, 92–94 and many others (see the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 96–97). This proposal has not received unqualified support, partly due to the multiplicity of suggested reconstructions. More recent discussions usually express

- 1:5–14 A catena of quotations establishing and clarifying the claim that the Son of God is superior to the angels.
- 2:1–4 An exhortation to attend closely to what God has said through the exalted Son.
- 2:5–9 The quotation and exposition of Ps 8:4–6 (LXX), showing that God has subjected the world to humans rather than angels.
- 2:10–18 An explanation that the solidarity of Christ with humanity qualified him to become a high priest so as to free the descendants of Abraham from their fear of death.

I restrict my comments to the quotation of Ps 110 in Heb 1:13, the allusion to the same Psalm in Heb 1:3, the reference to the entrance of the Son into the inhabited world in 1:6, and the quotation and interpretation of Ps 8:4–6 in Heb 2:5–9; 10–18.

Psalm 110:1

Psalm 110:1 is a key text in the argument of Hebrews, with a quotation in Heb 1:13 and allusions in 1:3; 8:1; 10:12–13; 12:2. While there has been considerable debate over the original *Sitz im Leben* of Psalm 110,² some recent interpreters assign it to the time of the Israelite monarchy and perhaps early in that period,³ considering it to be a royal Psalm addressed to a king reigning in Zion (v. 2). The monarch to whom it was addressed “reigned with the power and authority of Yahweh himself.”⁴ The NT authors allude to or quote this verse more often than any other OT text,⁵ and the number of studies that have been devoted to its treatment in the NT is a measure of its importance.⁶ The author of Hebrews, as do the other NT writers, applies the Psalm to Jesus, whom they

caution, often noting that even if there is a hymn fragment here, the author has modified it, and the original wording is no longer recoverable (Frankowski 1983: 184–91; Meier 1985b: 524–28; Attridge 1989: 41–42; Lane 1991a: 7–8; DeSilva 2000b: 86–87; Koester 2001: 178–79; O’Brien 2010: 47).

2 Goldingay 2008: 292.

3 Kraus 1989: 347; Eaton 2003: 6–7, 384; Hilber 2005: 76–88. Rooke 2000: 90–103 surveys the critical issues at stake. Goldingay 2008: 292 is agnostic on the dating of the Psalm on the basis that any decision needs to be based on evidence that is necessarily circumstantial.

4 Hay 1973: 19–20.

5 Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; Luke 20:42–43; 22:69; Acts 2:34–35; 5:31; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22. In Acts 7:55 the Son of Man stands at the right hand of God. It also appears in the longer ending of Mark (Mark 16:19).

6 Significant contributions to the understanding of Ps 110 in the NT include Coppens 1956; Kistemaker 1961; Hay 1973; Dupont 1974; Gourgues 1978; Loader 1978; 1981; Hengel 1995: 119–225; Anderson 2001.

consider to have been exalted to the place of highest honour, ruling with the power and authority of God.

The quotation of Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:13 agrees with the text of the LXX, but the allusions to the Psalm in the remainder of the book differ both from the quotation and from the other allusions. An analysis of the differences between the allusion in Heb 1:3 and the quotation in Heb 1:13 highlights the points that the text emphasises. I begin with the quotation, the standard from which the modifications introduced in the allusions can be identified, and then return to the allusion.

Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:13

The quotation comprises the words said in the Psalm to have been spoken by YHWH and appears precisely as in the extant LXX, although without the opening words Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου ("the Lord said to my lord"). These words are, nevertheless, implied in the rhetorical question that functions as a citation formula: πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε...; ("to which of the angels has he ever said...?"). The Psalm is understood as "first person direct speech... interpreted as the words of God to Jesus."⁷ This rhetorical question forms an inclusio around the catena of quotations in Heb 1:5–13, balancing a similar question about Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5.⁸

The question in v. 13 differs from the LXX in that the aorist εἶπεν in the opening words of the Psalm has been replaced by the perfect εἶρηκεν. While this may be no more than a stylistic variation,⁹ it does draw the reader's attention to the ποτέ ("ever") in the emphatic position at the end of the formula, with

⁷ Docherty 2009: 168.

⁸ Thompson 1976: 353 notes that "[T]he important place given to Ps 110:1 indicates that the catena is to be understood as an interpretation of the exaltation, a reflection on the hymn in 1:1–3." See also Meier 1985a: 168–89; 1985b: 504–33; Lane 1991a: 31–32, Ellingworth 1993: 129; Bauckham 2004: 177–78.

⁹ The rhetorical question introducing Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5 uses the aorist εἶπεν (which appears in Ps 2:7 and in Ps 110:1). Stylistic variations may also account for the other differences between the rhetorical questions in vv. 5, 13. See Vanhoye 1969: 208. Both Attridge 1989: 61 and Ellingworth 1993: 131 consider that this change in tense emphasises the continuing effect of the session at the right hand. If this reading of the perfect tense has any validity, it would be more correct to say that the perfect tense emphasises the continuing validity of the oracle in the Psalm. Barnard 2012: 269 proposes that the perfect tense indicates that "the God of Israel is now to be understood as one who has invited another to share his eternal throne." He does not explain this assertion. Recent studies of the aspect of the perfect tense tend away from the traditional "past action with continuing effect" force of the perfect, pointing out that it expresses imperfective aspect with heightened intensity. See Campbell 2007: 184–211;

the sense of the question being, “to which of the angels has he *ever* said”? This question (and the question in 1:5) underscore the superiority of the Son to the angels by pointing out that these words addressed by God to the Son were never addressed to angels.¹⁰

Each of the earlier quotations in the catena contains an explicit christological title either in the introductory formula or in the quotation; here, there is neither. Those titles are υἱός (“Son,” 1:5, 8), πρωτότοκος (“firstborn,” 1:6), θεός (“God,” 1:8, 9), κύριος (“Lord,” 1:10). While the addressee in the rhetorical question of 1:13 is unspecified, it is clear that the reader is to supply the answer: it is not the angels, but the exalted Son and Lord addressed throughout the rest of the catena whom God has invited to take his seat.¹¹

Apart from the tense of the verb in the introductory rhetorical question with its implication that the Psalm is addressed to the exalted Son rather than to the angels, the text agrees with that of the LXX. Clearly then, the author knew the OT Greek text in a form identical to that in which we know it, and the quotation presents a standard that can be used to compare the allusion to Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:3.¹²

Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:3

Hebrews 1:1–4 contrasts God’s speech in the past through the prophets with his definitive speech “in these last days” through a Son whom he appointed heir of all things. This Son, having made purification for sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heights, inheriting a name superior to angelic names, with the superiority of this name being the measure of his superiority to the angels. The Son is superior to the angels because he sits. This contrasts with the recurring theme in Second Temple Judaism that angels do not sit in God’s presence; they stand to serve.¹³

2008a: 50–51, followed by O’Brien 2010: 77. I discuss the aspect of the perfect tense more fully in my treatment of Heb 2:9, below.

10 I use an upper case S for Son although the word is anarthrous where it first appears in Heb 1:3. It is clear that the subject is the exalted Son of God, reigning alongside God. The Son is not identified as Jesus until Heb 2:9.

11 Meier 1985b: 519.

12 Rahlfs 1931: 276–77 notes no variant readings in the LXX in connection with the words quoted in Heb 1:3.

13 See my discussion of God’s throne in the Qumran Sabbath Songs in chapter 3 (above), and Barnard 2012: 77–78, 270. For angels standing in heaven see 11QMelch 11 10–11; Gen Rab. 65:21; 3 En. 16. In 2 En. 24:1–4 Enoch sits on God’s left in his role as a scribe. Humans sit in heaven in Ezek. Trag. 68–89; 1 En. 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:29, 108:12; Mark 14:62; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1–4; Rev 3:21; Asc. Isa 9:24–26.

Hebrews 1:1–4 is a single periodic sentence containing several adverbial clauses and several participles. There are two significant verbs in the indicative mood, one with God as subject (ἐλάλησεν, “he spoke”) and one with the Son as subject (ἐκάθισεν, “he sat down”).¹⁴ The temporal contrast between these two “speech-events” of God sets the context in which Hebrews is to be read. God spoke “formerly” (πάλαι) through the prophets, and has now spoken “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου¹⁵ τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) through a Son who has sat down at God’s right hand.

While the expression ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, or similar, appears several times in the LXX and the NT,¹⁶ only here is the demonstrative adjective τούτων appended. The words are equivalent to the Hebrew words אחרית הימים that appear in 4QmidrEschat^a, a text that makes use of Pss 2; 89; 2 Sam 7:14; Exod 15:17–18 to anticipate the building of an eschatological temple “in the last days.”¹⁷ Exodus 15:17 is not cited in Hebrews, although there is a possible echo in 11:16;¹⁸ Ps 2:7 appears in Heb 1:5; 5:5; 2 Sam 7:14 in 1:6, and Ps 89:28 (MT) is echoed in Heb 1:6.¹⁹ The presence of these texts in both Hebrews and Qumran is evidence of a conversation in Second Temple Judaism about eschatological expectation in connection with these texts, a conversation to which the author of Hebrews had a contribution to make.²⁰ However, while in the Qumran text

14 Other verbs in the indicative mood are ἔθηκεν (“appointed”), ἐποίησεν (“made”), κληρονομήσεν (“inherited”). These are all in clauses that are subordinated to the clauses containing ἐλάλησεν and ἐκάθισεν and describe the Son through whom God has spoken.

15 MSS Ψ, 629, 1505 and several other late witnesses read ἐσχάτων. The singular form has superior attestation.

16 The words appear with the genitive singular of ἔσχατος in Num 24:14; Jer 23:20; 25:19 (LXX, MT 49:39); Dan 10:14, and with the genitive plural of ἔσχατος in Gen 49:1; Deut 8:16; Josh 24:27; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1; Jer 37:24 (LXX, MT 30:24); Dan 2:28, 29; 2 Pet 3:3. ἐπ’ ἐσχάτω τῶν ἡμερῶν appears in Deut 4:30, and ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Isa 2:2; Dan 11:20; Acts 2:17 (replacing μετὰ ταῦτα, “after these things,” in Joel 2:28 LXX [MT: 3:1]). In some of these texts (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Isa 2:1; Dan 2:28–29; 10:14; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1) there is an eschatological orientation, as God’s people look to the age to come. In the NT, the last day (singular) is anticipated in John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:24; 12:48. The words ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (“in last days”) appears in 2 Tim 3:1 and combinations of ἔσχατος and χρόνος appear in 1 Pet 1:20; Jude 18.

17 See 4QmidrEschat^a III 2, 12, 15, 19, V 3; 1QSa I 1.

18 See the discussion in chapter 7, below.

19 See the discussion of Heb 1:6, later in this chapter.

20 I am not proposing that Hebrews is dependent on 4QmidrEschat^a. Brooke 2005a: 77 suggests that both authors “were acquainted with a tradition” that combined Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14, although they do different things with them.

the “last days” is the final period of history before the still future eschaton,²¹ in Hebrews, the demonstrative adjective indicates that, for this author, the eschatological age has arrived with the exaltation of the Son to the right hand of God.²²

Placing Heb 1:3 alongside Ps 109:1 (LXX) highlights the changes that the author made when he incorporated Ps 110:1 into his discourse.

Psalm 110 (LXX 109):1

Hebrews 1:3

Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

ὁς . . . καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλῶσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.

The Lord said to my lord; sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.

Who . . . having made purification for sins sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heights.²³

21 Steudel 1994b: 162–63.

22 Attridge 1989: 39; Lane 1991a: 10–11.

23 One minor change is the replacement of ἐκ δεξιῶν (“at the right hand”) in Ps 110:1 (and in Heb 1:13) with ἐν δεξιᾷ in Heb 1:3 (and in all the allusions to Ps 110:1 in NT). The expression ἐκ δεξιῶν (μου) appears several times in the Greek Psalter, rendering מִיְמִינִי (“from my right hand”) in Ps 15:8 (MT 16:8) and 90:7 (MT 91:7); לְיְמִינְךָ (“at your right hand”) in Ps 44:10 (MT 45:10) and Ps 109:1 (MT 110:1); עַל־יְמִינוֹ (“on his right hand”) in Ps 108:6 (MT 109:6; לְיְמִין אֲבִיון (“at the right hand of the needy”) in Ps 108:31 (MT 109:31); and עַל יְמִינְךָ (“at your right hand”) in Ps 109:5 (MT 110:5). The LXX translator of this part of the Psalter seems to be fond of the expression, using it three times in the space of a few verses to render a variety of Hebrew expressions. In Gen 48:13 ἐκ δεξιῶν and ἐν δεξιᾷ appear together, although they translate two different Hebrew expressions. Ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ renders בְּיָמִינוּ מִשְׁמָאל יִשְׂרָאֵל (“on his right, to the left of Israel”), and ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ renders בְּשִׁמְאֵלוֹ מִיְמִין יִשְׂרָאֵל (“on his left, to the right of Israel”). They are not quite interchangeable there, as Ellingworth 1993: 102–3 suggests, but they do seem to be stylistically different expressions used to communicate similar ideas. As for Hebrews, that ἐκ δεξιῶν appears in the quotation in 1:13 and ἐν δεξιᾷ in the allusions, indicates to Docherty 2009: 171 how faithful the author felt compelled to be “when formally citing a scriptural text.”

In the Psalm ὁ κύριος μου (“my Lord”) is commanded to sit down; in Hebrews it is υἱός (“a Son,” anarthrous)²⁴ who has sat down. Verse 5 will clarify that the υἱός of Psalm 2:7 is in view,²⁵ something confirmed by the first qualifying statement in the text, ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων (“whom he appointed heir of all things”), which echoes Ps 2:8.²⁶ In Hebrews, Ps 2 regularly appears alongside Ps 110, making it clear that the author sees Jesus in terms of the exalted Son of Ps 2, seated at the right hand of God in response to the command of Ps 110.²⁷

Like Ps 110, Ps 2 is a royal psalm used as part of the enthronement ceremony for ancient Israelite kings.²⁸ Using ancient oriental royal court hyperbole, the Psalm envisages the king ruling the nations with the power and authority of God, and as “Son of God.”²⁹ The echo of Ps 2 in Heb 1:2 and the quotation in Heb 1:5 complement the allusion to Ps 110 by identifying the Son as the ideal king in whom the promises to the ancient Davidic monarch have now found their eschatological fulfilment.

The next noteworthy modification is a change in the tense of the verb κάθιζω (“to sit”). God’s command to the king to sit on his right (the present middle imperative κάθου, “sit”!) is modified in Hebrews to the aorist indicative active ἐκάθισεν (“he sat”). The change of tense expresses the conviction that

24 The absence of the article focuses on the son in question, and emphasises his character as “a son” (Wallace 1996: 244–45). Thus, there is a qualitative difference between the former revelation ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (“in the prophets”) and the more recent revelation ἐν υἱῷ. Spicq 1952: 2: 5 comments, “L’absence de l’article . . . souligne la nature et la qualité du témoin . . . un fils est le personnage le plus qualifié pour parler de son père.” See also Attridge 1989: 43; Lane 1991a: 11; O’Brien 2010: 50. Delitzsch 1868: 1: 41–42 considers that υἱός functions as a proper name here, making the article unnecessary (see BDF §254, and Ellingworth 1993: 93). The article is sometimes omitted in prepositional phrases (BDF §255).

25 Wallace 2003: 44–47.

26 See, e.g. Loader 1981: 22–23; Attridge 1989: 40; Bruce 1990: 46; Lane 1991a: 12. Langkammer 1966: 273–80 argues for an allusion to God’s promise to Abraham that he would be father of many nations (Gen 17:5), but this seems to be alien to context of Heb 1.

27 In addition to these two allusions, Ps 2:7 appears in Heb 1:5 and again in Heb 5:5, where it is combined with Ps 110:4 to identify the Son of Ps 2 with the high priest of Ps 110. A final allusion appears in Heb 7:28 as part of the concluding summary to Heb 4:14–7:28. For connections between Ps 2 and Ps 110 see Eaton 2003: 284; Goldingay 2008: 291.

28 Craigie 1983: 64; Kraus 1988: 125; Eaton 2003: 65; Goldingay 2006: 95–96.

29 Loader 1981: 7; Craigie 1983: 68–69; Kraus 1988: 126, 133. McKenzie 1957: 34–36 discusses the *Sitz im Leben* of Ps 110 and notes, “the Israelite king is not viewed as a simple historical figure, but as a religious figure who incorporates in himself the kingdom of Israel and its hope for the future in which the kingship of Yahweh will become universally effective” (pp. 35–36).

P^s 2 and P^s 110 have found their fulfilment in the Son. The Son addressed in P^s 2:7 has taken his seat next to God “at the invitation of God,”³⁰ having been given the place of highest honour in the universe. This is a central claim in Hebrews, noted in every allusion to P^s 110:1. The text interprets the exaltation of Christ in terms of these royal psalms and envisages him ruling the world in the last days.

The description of God is significantly enhanced when compared with the Psalm, which simply refers to God with the personal pronoun μου. Hebrews claims that the Son has sat down at the right hand of τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (“the Majesty in the heights”). The change from the second person imperative to the third person indicative necessitated the replacement of the personal pronoun μου with an expression referring to God; however, in all four allusions in Hebrews the expression is different. Loader detects Jewish sensitivity with respect to the name of God,³¹ but this does not account for the term ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ in 10:12 or, indeed, the appearance of ὁ θεός in the first line of Hebrews. It seems more likely that the author chose his expressions for God with care and that the different expressions carry different nuances. It is also possible that the words are deliberate OT allusions.

This appears to be the case with the substantives ὑψηλός and μεγαλωσύνη. Ὑψηλός is an adjective, used relatively frequently as a substantive in the LXX.³² In the Deuteronomic history, it often refers to idolatrous high places.³³ It refers to the dwelling place of God in several texts,³⁴ and in MT P^s 89 (LXX 88):28 it is used adjectivally when YHWH promises that he will “appoint” (τίθῃμι) the Davidic king, the “firstborn” (πρωτότοκος) “higher” (ὑψηλός) than the kings of the earth. In Heb 1:2 τίθῃμι refers to the appointment of the Son as heir of all things, and Heb 1:6 refers to the Son as the πρωτότοκος. The appearance of these three words in P^s 89:28 and in Heb 1:2, 3 and 6 is evidence of an intertextual echo of this Psalm. While Hebrews does not explicitly quote P^s 89, which sets out the future intentions of YHWH with regard to the Davidic monarchy, it is clearly part of the thought world of the author. The Son of God is exalted in the heights, higher than all the kings of the earth.

30 Hay 1973: 86.

31 Loader 1981: 16. See also Windisch 1913: 13; Hay 1973: 86–87.

32 It only appears as a substantive here in the NT. Elsewhere it is used adjectivally in Matt 4:8; 17:1 Mark 9:2; Luke 16:15; Acts 13:17; Rom 11:20; 12:16; Heb 7:26; Rev 21:10, 12.

33 Deut 12:2; 3 Kgdms 3:4; 11:5; 12:31, 32; 13:2, 32, 33; 14:23; 15:14; 22:44 and in many other texts.

34 P^s 93 (LXX 92):4; 113 (LXX 112):5; Isa 33:5; 57:15. In Sir 24:4, Wisdom is said to dwell ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.

Μεγαλωσύνη seems to be a reverential periphrasis for God. It appears just three times in the NT, including two in Hebrews,³⁵ but is relatively common in the LXX.³⁶ It emphasises the greatness of God, thus the two terms ὑψηλός and μεγαλωσύνη serve to underscore the superlative exaltation of the Son alongside God.³⁷

The verb ἐκάθισεν (“he sat down”) is modified by two adverbial clauses in Heb 1:3. The first clause (καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος,³⁸ “having made purification for sins”) gives a cultic connotation to the Son’s exaltation, something not suggested in Ps 110:1.³⁹ The substantive καθαρισμός (“purification”) is most often used in the NT for ritual purification, but here and in 2 Pet 1:9 it has the sense of cleansing from sins. Both senses (ritual and moral cleansing) also appear in the LXX, at times in cultic contexts.⁴⁰ Of the seven statements in Heb 1:1–4, only this is original to Hebrews with the implication that it warrants special attention. It functions as an announcement of the subject of the long

35 Heb 1:3; 8:1; Jude 15.

36 Deut 32:3; 1 Chr 29:11; Ezra 4:46; Tob 12:6; 13:4, 8, 9; 14:2; Ps 78:11; 144:3, 6; 150:2; Ode 2:3; Prov 18:10; Wis 18:24; Sir 2:18; 18:5; 39:15; Dan 2:20; 4:22, 36 (LXX versification).

37 Gordon 2008: 57. Weiss 1991: 151 considers that μεγαλωσύνη comes by way of the δύναμις (“strength”) in Ps 110: 2, 3, reflected in Mark 14:62 and Matt 26:64, and ultimately derived from Dan 2:20. Michel 1966: 102 (note 2) and Braun 1984: 30–31 trace the derivation from כִּבְרוּת (“strength”), which is twice rendered by μεγαλωσύνη in the LXX (1 Chr 29:11; Ps 150:2), but this seems rather obscure.

38 P⁴⁶, the original hand of D and several minuscules add δι’ αὐτοῦ at the beginning of this clause, and the second reviser of D and other minuscules add δι’ ἑαυτοῦ. These additions probably have the effect of emphasising the force of the middle voice of the participle ποιησάμενος (Metzger 1994: 589). The external evidence for the reading adopted in NA²⁸ is strong, including $\aleph$, A, B, the first reviser of D, the original hand of H and numerous later witnesses. The second reviser of $\aleph$, the first reviser of D and several witnesses including the Majority Text add ἡμῶν after ἁμαρτιῶν. The pronoun is omitted in P⁴⁶, the original hand of $\aleph$, A, B, the original hand of D, P, Ψ , and numerous later witnesses, and should not be considered original. See the discussion in Mason 2008: 16 (note 29).

39 It is implied in Ps 110:4, exploited later in Hebrews, see Mason 2008: 16–18 and Docherty 2009: 169, both of whom make this connection since it is the text on which the author bases his identification of Jesus as a priest. Lane 1991a: 14–15, noting a sharp contrast with the preceding clauses that refer to the involvement of the Son in creation and providence, translates, “yet made purification for sins and then sat down” (p. 5).

40 Exod 29:36; 30:10; Lev 14:32; 15:13; Num 14:18; 1 Chr 23:28; Neh 12:45. For the NT see Mark 1:44; Luke 2:22; 5:14; John 2:6; 3:25. The verb καθαρίζω appears much more frequently in similar contexts in both the LXX and the NT. In particular, I note Lev 16:30, which deals with the Day of Atonement ceremony, significant in Heb 9:14, 22, 23; 10:2.

central section of Hebrews (5:1–10:18)⁴¹ and implies that the heavenly throne room where the Son sits is to be understood as a sanctuary.⁴² The original readers of Hebrews would have recognised a reference to the death of Jesus (who is not named until Heb 2:9), and they would probably have inferred that his death was to be interpreted in cultic terms, even though the text does not make this claim explicit until 2:17 or argue for it until 5:1–10.

The precise relationship of this clause to the aorist indicative verb ἐκάθισεν (“he sat down”) is difficult to specify, but probably refers to an action prior to that expressed in the main verb.⁴³ Comparison with Heb 10:11–12, which expresses similar ideas, clarifies this. Those verses contrast the actions of every priest who “stands” (ἕστηκεν, perfect indicative), “serving” (λειτουργῶν, present participle), and “offering” (προσφέρων, present participle) the same sacrifices, with the actions of Christ who “offered” (προσενέγκας, aorist participle) a single sacrifice for sin forever, and then “sat down” (ἐκάθισεν, aorist active) at the right hand of God, where he “waits” (ἐκδεχόμενος, present participle) for God to subdue his enemies. In Heb 10:11–12 Christ offers a sacrifice and then sits down; in Heb 1:3 the Son achieves purification for sin and then sits down.⁴⁴ Hebrews 9–10 will make it clear that he achieved this purification in his death.

The second adverbial clause follows the statement that the Son sat down: τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοῦς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα (“becoming as much superior to the angels as the name

41 This is almost universally accepted. See e.g. Spicq 1952: 2: 10; Hay 1973: 88; Attridge 1989: 45–46; Lane 1991a: 14–15, 18; Weiss 1991: 64–65, 148–49; Bauckham 2004: 169–70; Johnson 2006: 71; O’Brien 2010: 58–59; Barnard 2012: 135. Smith 1969: 67 notes the appearance of καθάρσις in 9:13 and καθαρίζω in 9:14, 9:22; 10:2, as well as καθάρσις in 10:22. He concludes “the ‘purification’ of 1:3 leads into the heart of the epistle.”

42 See Rissi 1987: 37, “[s]ince the whole theology of the Hebrews is cultic-priestly oriented, God’s world is presented primarily as a heavenly sanctuary”; Schenck 2001: 479, “Christ’s heavenly high priesthood is at root a metaphor built on the efficacy of his atoning death coupled with his ascension to the highest heaven—heaven’s holy of holies. Christ’s entrance as priest into the Holy of Holies of the true tabernacle is a metaphorically charged presentation of his exaltation to the right hand of God.” Weiss 1991:149 argues that the close relationship between the purification and the exaltation in this verse means that the exaltation can be read as “des Eintritts des Hohenpriesters in das himmlische Heiligtum.”

43 BDF 174–75, § 339 indicates that the relationship of a participle to a main verb must be determined by the context, and that an aorist participle of itself does not indicate antecedent time. Porter 1994b: 188 proposes the general rule that “[i]f a participle occurs before the finite verb on which it depends . . . the participle tends to refer to antecedent (preceding) action. If a participle occurs after the finite . . . verb on which it depends, it tends to refer to concurrent (simultaneous) or subsequent (following) action” (italics original).

44 Moffitt 2011: 48.

he has inherited is superior to theirs"). Several scholars suggest that this second clause expresses the result or consequence of his exaltation,⁴⁵ but a participle expressing the result of an action is normally in the present tense.⁴⁶ To suggest that he becomes superior to the angels consequent upon his sitting in heaven is somewhat incongruous. Rather, he sits down *because* he is superior to the angels (who only stand).⁴⁷ It seems more likely that this clause expresses something of the significance of his heavenly session.⁴⁸ Since the Son sits in heaven, it is clear that he has become superior to the angels.

The superiority of his inherited name to angelic names is the measure of his superiority to the angels. Scholars debate the identification of this name, with many concluding that it is "Son,"⁴⁹ although this is difficult, since it is the Son who inherits this superior name. Guthrie suggests that the "name" is a reference to the "designation or rank formerly reserved for God,"⁵⁰ but it is preferable to understand the name as the Tetragrammaton, יהוה, or κύριος, as the Tetragrammaton is conventionally translated in the LXX.⁵¹ Like the king of Ps 110, now the Son becomes God's chief agent, ruling with the power and authority of God. The opening words of Ps 110 (Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, "the Lord said to my lord," i.e., the king in the Psalm) are one factor that may have led to this designation.⁵²

45 Meier 1985a: 185; Hagner 1990: 26; Guthrie 1998:49; Bauckham 2009: 23; O'Brien 2010: 60–61.

46 Wallace 1996: 638.

47 See footnote 13 to this chapter (above).

48 Wallace 1996: 629–30.

49 E.g. Hay 1973: 109–10; Käsemann 1984: 97–99; Meier 1985a: 187–88; Attridge 1989: 47–48; Lane 1991a: 17; Ellingworth 1993: 106–7; Schenck 1997: 93–98; 2007: 87; DeSilva 2000b: 91–92; Koester 2001: 181–82; Mackie 2007: 217–18; 2008: 448; O'Brien 2010: 60–61.

50 Guthrie 1998: 50; 2003: 273–74. See also Koester 2001: 182. Hurst 1987: 157 suggests that the "names" are Son, God and Lord, from the use of these titles in Heb 1:4–14. He omits "Firstborn" (v. 6).

51 Rowland 1982: 113; Gieschen 1998: 297; 2003: 142–43; Barker 1999: 99; Hannah 1999: 142–44; Bauckham 2004: 175; 2009: 19–22; Johnson 2006: 73–74; Barnard 2012:157–70. In Apoc. Ab. 10:3 the Holy one addresses the angel Yahoel as "the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name" (trans. Kulik 2004: 167); and 3 En. 12:1–5 (where Metatron, Prince of the Presence is given the name "the Lesser YHWH"); 48:1; 48c:7. See also Exod 23:21, and for the conferral of names see 1 En. 48:2–5; 69:13–29. It is "the name above all names" of Phil 2:6 as Hengel 1976: 87–88 points out, thus, there is no contradiction in 1:8, where Jesus is addressed as "God," and in 1:10 where he is addressed as "Lord."

52 Hay 1973: 104–8. This is also the point of Jesus' question to the Pharisees in Mark 12:35–37; Matt 22:43–45; Luke 20:41–44; John 17:11. Acts 2:32–36; Rom 1:4; 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3; Phil 2:6–11; Rev 19:11–16 reflect traditions similar to those encountered here in Hebrews where Jesus

With these modifications, the author emphasises that the eschaton has arrived with the exaltation of the Son to God's right hand. He rules with the power and authority of God as God's chief agent. This exaltation followed his making purification for sins, and resulted God honouring him with the name "Lord," indicating his superiority to the angels. Similar statements were made to the Davidic monarch in the OT, where they need to be seen against the background of ancient oriental royal court hyperbole, but the text of Hebrews implies that these statements now reflect the reality of the exaltation of the Son of God.

The Catena of Quotations (Heb 1:5–14)

The author establishes the superiority of the Son to the angels in Heb 1:5–14 with a catena of seven OT texts, which he reads with reference to the exalted Son.⁵³ Scholars debate the source of the quotation in v. 6, but the source of the other quotations is clear. Hebrews 1:5 juxtaposes Psalm 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14, applying the title "Son" to Jesus. Psalm 2:7 is from the royal Psalm already alluded to in Heb 1:2, claiming that the Son has been "appointed heir of all things" (ὁν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων), and 2 Sam 7:14 is part of Nathan's oracle to David concerning his son who will build a house for YHWH. Hebrews 1:7 cites Ps 104:4 (LXX 103:4) referring to the subordinate function of angels as "winds" (πνεύματα) and "a flame of fire" (πυρὸς φλόγα), setting up a contrast in vv. 8–9 with Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8, MT 45:7–8), which the author reads as God addressing the Son as "God" (θεός)⁵⁴ and celebrating his righteous rule. In Ps 102:25–27

is accorded the highest honour after his death and resurrection. Important background to this notion appears in 4Q491c; Ezek. Trag. 69–82; Wis 9:4; 1 En. 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 69:27; 3 En. 10:1; Lad. Jac. 1:5; 2:7; and the Targums to Gen 28:12.

53 Docherty 2009: 177 argues that the author's primary aim in the catena of quotations is the removal of the citations from their context and their placement in Heb 1, surrounding it "with a new co-text which narrows down its meaning in a particular direction." Thus, these texts establish the claims made concerning the Son in Heb 1:1–4.

54 The Hebrew text of Ps 45:7 reads בַּסֵּאף אֱלֹהִים, words that could be rendered either "God is your throne," or "your throne O God." Early attestation for the latter reading is found in the Targum, which reads בּוֹרְסֵי יְקָרְךָ יְהוָה קִיִּים לְעֵלְמִי עֵלְמִין ("your divine throne, YHWH, endures forever and ever"), and in Aquila who translates אֱלֹהִים in this line as a vocative θεέ. Attridge 1989: 58 points out that "[t]he author of Hebrews stands in this exegetical tradition and takes the psalm as an address to the Son as God." The LXX reads ὁ θεός σου, ὁ θεός and is cited verbatim in Hebrews. While ὁ θεός is in the nominative case, it functions here as a vocative (BDF 81–82, para. 147), and with most commentators, I read it as such, with the Son addressed as God. For a full discussion of both the Hebrew text, the LXX and the reading of these in Hebrews see Harris 1984: 65–89; 1985: 129–62. The major

(LXX 101: 26–28) the psalmist addresses God as “Lord” (κύριος), the one who laid the foundations of the earth. The earth may perish but YHWH remains the same and his years have no end.⁵⁵ Hebrews 1:10–12 quotes this Psalm as addressed to the Son and the catena ends with Ps 110:1, rounding the chapter off by forming an inclusio with the allusion to the Psalm in v. 3. A discussion of the entire catena is outside my scope, however, one verse in particular (v. 6) warrants discussion as it locates the exalted Son in ἡ οἰκουμένη (“the inhabited world”).

Heb 1:6a is a citation formula that reads ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει,⁵⁶ and Heb 1:6b is an OT quotation, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (“and let all God’s angels worship him”). The source of the quotation is debated with the options being Deut 32:43 or Ps 97 (LXX 96):7. The Psalm text reads προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ, πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ (“worship him all you angels”) and the Deuteronomy text καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ (“and let all the sons of God worship him”). Neither of these is precisely the same as Heb 1:6b, although the Deuteronomy text reflected in Ode 2:43 reads καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (“and let all the angels of God worship him”), which agrees with Heb 1:6 apart from the addition of the definite article before ἄγγελοι.⁵⁷ While the psalm text is an attractive suggestion, in that οἰκουμένη appears in v. 4,⁵⁸ most scholars conclude that the most likely source is Deut 32:43, in a form equivalent to Ode 2:43 or 4QDeut^a.⁵⁹ As Moffitt suggests, however, “a dichotomous approach

commentaries read ὁ θεός as a nominative functioning as a vocative, e.g. Attridge 1989: 58–60; Lane 1991a: 29–30; Ellingworth 1993: 121–23; Koester 2001: 194; O’Brien 2010: 72–75; Cockerill 2012: 109–10. See also Bauckham 2004: 175–85; 2009: 24–26.

55 For this reading of Ps 102:25–27 see Goldingay 2008: 159–60.

56 I offer no translation of the citation formula at this point, since every word is the subject of intense debate.

57 This line is missing from the MT, but supplied in the Critical Apparatus in BHS from 4QDeut^a II 5 ii 7, which reads והשתחוּ לוּ כָּל אֱלֹהִים (“and bow down to him all you gods”). See the discussion in Wevers 1977: 359; 1995: 533–35.

58 Moffitt 2011: 72–73 (note 65) notes this, as well as what he describes as “several motifs that resonate with the concerns of the writer”.

59 Hurst 1987: 157–59; Attridge 1989: 57; Bruce 1990: 56–57; Grässer 1990–97: 80; Lane 1991a: 28; Ellingworth 1993: 118–19; DeSilva 2000b: 98; Koester 2001: 193; Gheorghita 2003: 42; Bauckham 2004: 179 (note 27); Johnson 2006: 78; Docherty 2009: 133–34, 156; O’Brien 2010: 70–71. Allen 2008: 44–52 gives a comprehensive discussion, and ultimately opts for Deut 32:43 (pp. 57–58).

to this question is misguided” and it maybe that both Deut 32 and Ps 97 are in the background.⁶⁰

I make two comments on the source of the quotation before moving on to the citation formula. First, the author recognised his quotation as an authoritative text calling on all God’s angels to worship the Son, indicating a qualitative difference between the angels and the Son. It therefore supports the claim that the Son shares the divine identity and is to be worshipped as God. This quotation is stark in the context, because while the other quotations ascribe divine titles to the Son, this one claims that worship is due to the Son. It also underlines the uniqueness of the Son, for here God commands the angels to worship someone other than God.⁶¹ Secondly, Deut 32 is set just prior to the entry to the promised land and is the first hint of Exodus motifs that become more prominent in Heb 3–4. Along with this, the LXX superscription to Ps 96 (MT 97) reads τῷ Δαυιδ, ὅτε ἡ γῆ αὐτοῦ καθίσταται (“For David when his land is founded”).⁶² As Moffitt notes, while it is uncertain whether the author of Hebrews was aware of this superscription, it is “an attempt to link the text of the psalm with the accession of David to the throne of Israel.”⁶³ The link with David’s rule and the mention of the rule of ὕμνῳ (vv. 1, 9) open the door to the eschatological interpretation evident in Heb 1, with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God in terms of another royal psalm (Ps 110).⁶⁴ If both Deut 32 and Ps 97 are in the frame the text looks back to Exodus and anticipates the eschatological

60 Moffitt 2011: 72–73 (note 65). Guthrie 1998: 67 and Wright 2003: 7 suggest that Ps 97:7 is a more likely source. Manson 1951: 92; Thompson 1982: 132 (note 17); Charles 1990: 176 (note 31) and Weiss 1991: 161 propose that Heb 1:6b is a conflation of Ps 97:7 and Deut 32:43. For the significance of Deut 32 in Hebrews see Allen 2008: 57–58; Peeler 2014: 54 (note 123).

61 Bauckham 1999: 66–67; Barnard 2012: 247–52. Close to this is Jos. As. 15:11–12, where Aseneth prostrates herself before Michael and worships God. She asks his name so that she can worship him, although he refuses to disclose it. In the Ezek. Trag., the stars prostrate themselves before the enthroned Moses. In 1 En. 48:5 all who dwell on earth will (in the eschaton) fall down and worship before the Son of Man, but they glorify and bless and sing hymns to the Lord of Spirits. In Apoc. Zeph. 6 Zephaniah is forbidden to worship Ieremiel. In 2 En. 22:7 the angels do obeisance. Orlov 2003b: 286 reads this as the worship of Enoch, but there is no direct object for the verb “do obeisance” in either recension in Andersen 1983: 138–39, and Forbes 1913: 443 has the angels bowing down to the Lord. See Stone 1993: 148; Macaskill 2007: 223.

62 This translation from Moffitt 2011: 72.

63 Ibid.: 72. Moffitt discusses the textual issues around the superscription on pp. 71–72 (note 62). I need not repeat them here.

64 Ibid.: 71–74.

consummation of that in the enduring reign of the Son. The citation formula reflects both of these moments in the history of God's people.

At issue in the citation formula are (1) the identification of the time reference of the expression ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ; (2) the syntactical function of the adverb πάλιν; (3) the referent of the substantives οἰκουμένη and πρωτότοκος; and (4) the significance of πρωτότοκος in the present context.

The πρωτότοκος ("firstborn") of 1:6 is clearly the Son of Heb 1:2 and the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτῷ ("him") in 1:6b, whom the angels are to worship. However, the rationale behind the use of πρωτότοκος is not so clear. Montefiore refers to Luke 2:7, where Mary is said to have given birth to τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον ("to her firstborn son"), and to Luke 2:13–14 where the angels are present giving glory to God.⁶⁵ In Luke 2:7 πρωτότοκος has the sense of (temporal) priority of birth, a sense it only has in that text in the NT, and expresses the relationship of Jesus to Mary.⁶⁶ Elsewhere it refers not to priority of birth, but to priority of rank.⁶⁷ This word is an honorific title and, in most cases where it is used of Jesus in the NT, it expresses his special relationship to God.

That it refers to rank rather than honour is clear in Exod 4:22, where Israel is God's πρωτότοκος, and in Ps 89:28 (MT). Here, God announces concerning David's descendant, κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς ("and I will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth"), and since, as I have already noted, there are other allusions to this Psalm in Heb 1, this seems to be a more likely source of the imagery.⁶⁸

65 Montefiore 1964: 45–46. Other similarities have been detected between Luke 2 and Heb 1:6, see Helyer 1976: 9–10. Πρωτότοκος appears in Luke 2:7; οἰκουμένη in Luke 2:1; the heavenly host praises God in Luke 2:13; and there is an allusion to Ps 2:7 in Luke 1:32 and to 2 Sam 7:14 in Luke 1:32–33, 69–71.

66 Nolland 1989: 105. On the other hand, Bovon 2002: 85–86 suggests Luke 2:7 implies the theological implications of the notion of the firstborn. It places "Jesus in a privileged relationship to God, and not in a relationship with later sisters and brothers." See also Langkammer 1993: 190; and *TLNT* 211.

67 Michaelis 1968: 876; Bartels 1986: 668–69; BDAG 894, s.v. πρωτότοκος, 2. See Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Heb 11:28; 12:23; Rev 1:5. For this sense in the LXX see Gen 4:4; 27:19; 43:33; 48:18; 49:3; Exod 4:22–23; 13:2; 22:28; 34:20; Lev 27:26; Num 3:12–13; 8:16–18; Deut 21:16–17; 2 Chr 21:3; Ps 89:28 (MT, LXX 88:28).

68 Attridge 1989: 56. This allusion is referenced in the margin of NA²⁸. Stuckenbruck 1995: 120 lists other verbal links between Ps 89 and Heb 1, including the rhetorical questions in vv. 5 and 13, which he traces to Ps 89:6 (p. 135, note 228). For the connection with Ps 89 see, e.g. Helyer 1976: 1–11, 17; Loader 1981: 9–10; Caird 1984: 75; Bruce 1990: 56; Lane 1991a: 26–27; Ellingworth 1993: 118; DeSilva 2000b: 96; Koester 2001: 192–93; Bauckham 2004: 178; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 414–15; O'Brien 2010: 79–80. Andriessen 1976: 295–97 downplays the suggestion, preferring to see a parallel with Deut 6:10 and the

As Attridge notes, “The term ultimately derives from the same royal ideology evidenced in Ps 2 and 2 Sam 7, being found once in the Psalms [in 89:28, MT].”⁶⁹

There are two ways to read the adverb πάλιν (“again”) in this context. It can be read either as introducing the third quotation in the catena, or as modifying verb εισαγάγη, in which case it would refer to a second or subsequent entry of the firstborn into the οἰκουμένη,⁷⁰ a reading adopted, mainly (but not exclusively) by earlier interpreters of Hebrews.⁷¹ However, the immediate context is a set of three OT quotations, with πάλιν introducing the second and the third (vv. 5, 6). In Heb 1:5, it introduces the second quotation, and it should probably be read in the same way in v. 6, introducing the third quotation.⁷² In this case, the three quotations belong together and establish the Son’s superiority to the

-
- use of πρωτότοκος for Israel. Scholer 1991: 146 and Allen 2008: 57 allow this possibility, but prefer to see πρωτότοκος as pointing to the same word used in 12:23 for the people of God.
- 69 Attridge 1989: 56. Grässer 1990–97: 1: 78–79 considers the derivation from Ps 89:28 (MT) to be “not proven.” He prefers to find the background in Hellenistic Judaism, and connects the title with other epithets for Jesus in Hebrews such as ἀρχηγός (“pioneer”), πρόδρομος (“forerunner”) and ποιμὴν ὁ μέγας (“the great shepherd”). He makes a connection with the gnostic myth of the redeemed redeemer and draws several parallels from Philo, most of which concern the exalted place of Moses. Philo uses πρωτότοκος several times, but apart from *Sacr.* 126 where it is a metaphor for reasoning powers, it is always used in a natural sense to refer to an eldest offspring, whether human or animal. He also uses πρωτόγονος (“firstborn”) several times in an exalted sense. See *Post.* 63, (referring to Ex. 4:22); *Agr.* 151; *Conf.* 62–63 (referring to the “Branch” of Zech 6:12); *Conf.* 146 (God’s firstborn the λόγος); *Fug.* 208; *Somm.* 1.215. Grässer also connects the title πρωτότοκος in Hebrews with Col 1:18, Rom 8:29 and Acts 26:23. πρωτότοκος does not appear in the last of these, and in the first two it is not used absolutely, as here and in Ps 89. Grässer’s arguments are weak and his conclusions difficult to accept. Stuckenbruck 1995: 120 notes that none of the passages usually cited from Greek Jewish literature (outside the LXX) “furnishes an intelligible background” for what we have in Heb 1.
- 70 On the possible senses of πάλιν in this context, see BDAG 752, s.v. πάλιν 2, 3 and 4. πάλιν introduces successive OT quotations in 1:5; 2:13; 10:30; and refers to the repetition of an action in 4:7; 5:12; 6:1, 6.
- 71 This results in reading ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εισαγάγη as “when he again brings . . .” This is adopted by Delitzsch 1868: 1: 66–67; Westcott 1892: 22–24; Windisch 1913: 15; Schierse 1955: 94–95; Kistemaker 1961: 19; Montefiore 1964: 45; Michel 1966: 113; Andriessen 1976: 296–300; Swetnam 1981:143; Loader 1981 23–24; Allen 2008: 54.
- 72 This results in the reading, “and again, when he brings . . .” For a similar construction see Wis 14:1. Meier 1985b: 509–10 gives detailed arguments as to why the particular word order in Heb 1:6 is necessary, and does not require the adoption of the other reading. This reading is adopted by Moffatt 1924: 10–11; Spicq 1952: 2: 17; Helyer 1976: 7–8; Thompson 1982: 132; Attridge 1989: 55; Bruce 1990: 56; Lane 1991a: 26; Koester 1994: 192; Schenck 2001: 478–79; Caneday 2008: 32–33; O’Brien 2010: 68; Moffitt 2011: 57.

angels from the OT. Moreover, the causal particle γάρ at the start of Heb 1:5 relates the quotations back to the exaltation of the Son and its consequences in terms of superiority to angels. The first two quotations underline the Son's superiority to the angels by what God says about him, and the third underlines his superiority to the angels by virtue of God's command that they worship him.⁷³ An examination of the expression ὅταν δὲ . . . εἰσαγάγῃ will show this to be the case.

A clause with an aorist subjunctive following ὅταν normally expresses "a future contingency from the perspective of the time of the main verb,"⁷⁴ in this case λέγει, and since λέγει refers to an utterance in Deut 32:43, it could refer to any event in the career of the Son.⁷⁵ There are three options: the incarnation, the ascension or the Parousia.⁷⁶ The solution to this issue depends upon the referent of οἰκουμένη,⁷⁷ a word that appears here and in 2:5 in the expression ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν ("the world to come to which we are referring"). I will argue that both have the same referent.

Οἰκουμένη is the present passive participle of οἰκέω used as a substantive. BDAG gives four senses in which it is used: (1) the inhabited world "... exclusive of the heavens above and nether regions"; (2) the inhabitants of the world; (3) the Roman Empire; and (4) an extraordinary use in 1 Clem. 60:1 where it "seems to mean *the whole world* (so far as living beings inhabit it, therefore the realm of transcendent beings as well)."⁷⁸ BDAG lists Heb 2:5 under this last sense, and Heb 1:6 under the first sense, that is, the inhabited world. If this is

73 Schenck 2003: 48–50.

74 Wallace 1996: 479.

75 Bruce 1990: 58. The same construction (ὅταν followed by an aorist subjunctive) appears three times in 1 Cor 15:24–28. In 1 Cor 15:24 the reference is clearly to "a future reality whose time is not known" (Fee 1987: 752), and the construction appears again in v. 28 with the same sense. In v. 27 it seems to have an analogous function to its use in Heb 1:6, introducing an allusion to the Jewish Scriptures, with the most coherent option being to read the expression ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ("and when he says") as referring to the "speaking" of the Scripture just quoted, an event that took place in the past, see e.g. Thistleton 2000: 1235–36. Moulton and Turner 1963: 113 list Heb 1:6 and 1 Cor 15:27 as instances of the normal usage (definite action taking place in the future concluded before the action of the main verb), but that makes little sense in 1 Cor 15:27.

76 Moffitt 2011: 53–63 has a full discussion of these options. Owen 1854: 151–52 lists three other possibilities: the resurrection, the effectual preaching of the gospel, and the 1000-year reign of Christ on earth. Bateman 1997: 222 thinks it refers to the baptism of Jesus since the voice from heaven at that time quotes Ps 2:7 (Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17; Luke 2:22).

77 Caneday 2008: 29; Moffitt 2011: 53.

78 BDAG 699–700.

the case, Heb 1:6 refers to the entrance of the Son into this world of time and space, either at the incarnation or the Parousia, when he returns to earth a second time (Heb 9:28).⁷⁹

Attridge, noting that οἰκουμένη normally refers to the “inhabited human world,” and that “introduce into the world” is “a common Hebrew idiom” for giving birth,⁸⁰ argues that Heb 1:6 is a reference to the incarnation.⁸¹ This is unlikely for several reasons. First, Heb 2:9 refers to the incarnation as the time when Jesus became lower than the angels; Heb 1:6 describes a time when he became superior to the angels.⁸² Secondly, Heb 10:5 refers to the incarnation as Christ’s entry into the κόσμος (“world”) rather than the οἰκουμένη. Thirdly, a reference to the incarnation in Heb 1:6 would introduce an “anticlimax and reversal of the sequence begun in 1:5.”⁸³

The second option is the Parousia,⁸⁴ which also preserves the normal sense of οἰκουμένη as the inhabited world. The Synoptic Gospels report that the Parousia will be accompanied by “the holy angels” (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26), and the Parousia does appear elsewhere in Hebrews (9:28). Nevertheless, the

79 Michel 1967: 159; Flender 1975: 519, and Adams 2009: 135 suggest that in Heb 1:6 the word refers to the present inhabited world and that in 2:5 it refers to the world to come. See also PGL 944. Moffitt 2011: 59–63 gives seven factors that suggest the referent of οἰκουμένη in Heb 1:6 is the same as in 2:5. *LSJ* 1205 does not refer to Heb 1:6, but suggests that Heb 2:5 refers to “the kingdom of Christ.” Strack and Billerbeck 1924: 3: 681 equate the expression in Heb 2:5 with the Hebrew expression עולם הבא (“the age to come”). As well as referring to the world to come, Hebrews also refers to the “age to come” (6:5) and the “city to come” (13:14), all of which refer to the same reality.

80 Attridge 1989: 56, cf. Spicq 1952: 2: 17. The Hebrew phrase for “bring into the world” cited by Spicq and Attridge is הביא לעולם, although Jenni (*TLOT* 862) and *HALOT* 799 note that the sense “world” for עולם does not appear until the first century C.E. Moffatt 1924: 10 cites similar expressions in Epictetus and Pseudo-Musonius, but these expressions simply use εἰσάγω to refer to giving birth and there is no reference to “the world.”

81 Other scholars who refer the expression to the incarnation include Spicq 1952: 2: 17; Lindars 1961: 211; Michel 1966: 113; Michaelis 1968: 880; Caird 1984: 75–76; Adams 2009: 135. Patristic authors adopting this reading include Chrysostom (*Hom. Heb. III*, see PG 63: 27–28), Theodoret Cyr. (*Interpretation of Hebrews I*, see PG 82: 685).

82 Schenck 2003: 50; Caneday 2008: 31; Moffitt 2011: 54–56.

83 Caneday 2008: 33.

84 The Parousia is proposed by Westcott 1892: 22–23; Loader 1981: 23–25; Käsemann 1984: 112; Weiss 1991: 162–63. This reading appears in the Vulgate (*et cum iterum introducit primum-simul in orbem terrarum*) and is adopted by Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra eunomium* 2:8; 4:3). Helyer 1976: 11–12 sees no need to differentiate between the ascension and the Parousia. He comments: “The introduction of the Son into the ‘age to come’ begins at his ascension and is culminated at the Parousia and visible reign” (p. 12).

major problem with this option is that the three quotations in vv. 5–6 are a set, showing together that OT announced the superiority over the angels that the Son gained at his exaltation. The argument coheres better if the third quotation is taken in the same way as the first two and is seen as a reference to the entry of the Son into the “heavenly world.”⁸⁵ The other instance of οἰκουμένη in Hebrews indicates that this is indeed the case. Heb 2:5 refers to τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν (“the world to come to which we refer”), and the most natural way to understand this expression is to see it as a reference back to the οἰκουμένη of Heb 1:6.⁸⁶

The difficulty with this reading is that it is unusual for οἰκουμένη to refer to the heavenly world. This calls for some explanation.⁸⁷ The word appears over fifty times in the LXX, usually with the sense of the world created by God and inhabited by people.⁸⁸ At times, it is the world that God will judge.⁸⁹ However, there are some cases where the word has an eschatological orientation, referring to the world to come. It appears with this sense several times in the so-called enthronement Psalms (93, 95–99). Psalm 93 (LXX 92):1 claims that ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν . . . ἐστερέωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἥτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται

85 Caneday 2008: 33; Barnard 2012: 237–42. Cf. Vanhoye 1964: 253, “[C]ette exaltation ne se situe par lors du retour du Christ, mais, selon le contexte de l’épître et la doctrine unanime du N.T., elle a eu lieu déjà, dans son triomphe pascal.” In Asc. Isa. 11:32, Isaiah sees Jesus returning to the seventh heaven and sitting down at the right hand of the great glory, to the accompaniment of angelic worship.

86 Balz 1991: 504; Schenck 2001: 478; 2003: 49–50; Caneday 2008: 31. Hebrews 2:5 introduces a quotation from Ps 8, a text frequently linked with Ps 110 in early Christian exegesis (see Hay 1973: 35, 42; Loader 1981: 30; Stuckenbruck 1995 129–20; Albl 1999: 226–27; Bauckham 2004: 169). The connection between the two Psalms supports the suggestion of Stuckenbruck 1995: 135–36 that the citation of Ps 8 is the final OT citation in the set that began in 1:3 with Ps 110:1 establishing the superiority of Christ to the angels; and Caird 1959: 49; 1984: 77, who suggests that the entire argument of Heb 1 needs to be read in the light of the quotation and explanation of Ps 8 in Heb 2. Caird (*ibid.*: 75–76) reads Heb 1:6a as a reference to the incarnation, and wonders why the author should refer to angelic worship of the Son in his earthly life, when he was “a little lower than the angels.”

87 The suggestion that the οἰκουμένη is the heavenly world was first made by Schierse 1955: 96. Numerous scholars adopt this suggestion, including Vanhoye 1964: 253; Meier 1985b: 507; Bruce 1990: 58; Weiss 1991: 162–64; Lane 1991a: 1: 27; Ellingworth 1993: 117–18; Guthrie 1998: 69; DeSilva 2000b: 96–97; Schenck 2001: 478–79; 2003: 49–50; Koester 2001: 193; Eisele 2003: 57–60; Helyer 2006: 3–7; Johnson 2006: 69; Mitchell 2007: 48; Allen 2008: 55; Caneday 2008: 28–39; O’Brien 2010: 69. See the comprehensive discussion in Moffitt 2011: 63–70.

88 For example (all the following reflect LXX versification) Ps 23:1; 48:2; 49:12; 71:8; 88:12; 89:2; Prov 8:31; Isa 14:14; 37:18; Jer 10:12; 28:15; Lam 4:12.

89 E.g. 2 Kgdms 22:16; Ps 9:9; 17:16; 95:13; Isa 10:23; 13:5, 9, 11; 24:1 (LXX versification).

(“The Lord has begun to reign . . . he has established the world, it shall never be moved”),⁹⁰ and this is repeated in Ps 96 (LXX 95):10, (ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, καὶ γὰρ κατώρθωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἣτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται, “the Lord has begun to reign, for he has set right the world, which shall not be moved”). In Ps 96:10–13 the entire created order (including the heavens) joins in the praise of ὙΗΩΗ the coming king. Kraus comments, “[t]he worship of Israel is governed by the signature of an eschatological, end-time enthronement of Yahweh; his sacral limits . . . have been extended into universality.”⁹¹ These Psalms celebrate the reign of God who is coming to judge the οἰκουμένη (“world”) and set things right.

It is this eschatological orientation that informs the sense of οἰκουμένη in Heb 2:5, and this sense is carried back to Heb 1:6 with the words τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν (“the world to come to which we refer”).⁹² In “these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, Heb 1:2) the exalted Son of God has taken his seat alongside God in the world to come.

Further echoes of these Psalms appear at the end of Heb 12. Hebrews 12:26 quotes Hag 2:6, ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν (“yet once more I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven”).⁹³ The author then explains that what can be shaken (the things that have been made) will be removed so that what cannot be shaken can remain, and he encourages the readers to give thanks and to offer acceptable worship to God, because they are receiving an “unshakeable kingdom” (βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον, 12:28). This unshakeable kingdom is the οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα of Heb 2:5, to which the

90 Eisele 2003: 59 reads ἐβασίλευσεν as an ingressive aorist. The Hebrew *Vorlage* is מָלַךְ, which has an ingressive-durative sense here, “YHWH has entered upon royal rule and has governed since as king” (Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 448). See also Goldingay 2008: 66–67. This understanding was first proposed by Mowinckel 1966: 1–10 (first published 1939) and has been subjected to vigorous debate ever since. See the brief discussion in Kraus 1989: 233–35 and Tate 1990: 472. Whether or not the verbs are taken in this way is not critical to this study, although, when read in this way, they do accord neatly with the theme of the exaltation of the Son. The exaltation of the Son of God in Heb 1 carries the implication that he has begun to rule with the power and authority of God, whose rule these psalms celebrate.

91 Kraus 1989: 255. On the eschatological orientation of these Psalms see Weiser 1962: 618; Tate 1990: 481; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 450, 467.

92 Caneday 2008: 34–35.

93 The text in Hebrews differs slightly from the LXX of Hag 2:6, reading “ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν” (“yet once more I will shake the heaven and the earth and the sea and the dry land”). I discuss this text more fully in chapter 7, below.

Son of God has been exalted in the present.⁹⁴ Just as in Ps 93:1 and 96:10 the οἰκουμένη over which the Lord reigns “cannot be shaken” (οὐ σαλευθήσεται), so also in Heb 12:28, the kingdom that the readers are receiving is an “unshakeable kingdom” (βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον). This is the same “heavenly” reality as the rest of God that the readers are to strive to enter in Heb 4.⁹⁵ It is the true tent pitched by the Lord of which Jesus is a minister in Heb 8:1–2; the city with foundations of Heb 11:10; the better country of Heb 11:16; “Mount Zion . . . the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem” of Heb 12:22; and the city to come of Heb 13:14.

As I noted at the start of this discussion, the quotation from Deut 32:43 brings with it Exodus motifs. With these in mind, an alert reader may also hear a subtle echo of Exod 16:35 in Heb 1:6. This text reads οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἔφαγον τὸ μαν ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἕως ἤλθον εἰς γῆν οἰκουμένην (“and the Israelites ate the manna for forty years until they came into an inhabited land”). Here, the γῆν οἰκουμένην is the promised land, an inhabited place over against the uninhabited desert.⁹⁶ As the author of Hebrews reflects on the exaltation of the Son to the right hand of God, he seems also to have in mind the entry of the people of God into the promised land. He applies this typologically to the Son’s entry to the world to come and the eschatological goal of God’s people in that same world. As Schenck comments “. . . a metaphorical reference to heaven as the truly civilised world is exactly the kind of thing we would expect from the

94 Vanhoye 1964: 250–51, 1969: 154–57 makes the connection by way of the words οἰκουμένη and ἀσάλευτον in Psalm 96 (LXX 95), while Lane 1991b: 485–86 refers to Ps 93 (LXX 92):4. See also Meier 1985b: 507–11; Koester 2001: 192; Eisele 2003: 57–60; Mackie 2007: 42–43. Attridge 1989: 55–56 finds the connection with Ps 93 “weak. While Vanhoye understood a technical Platonic dualism between the shakeable earthly world and the unshakeable world to come, Moffitt 2011: 70–118 examines the ideas in the LXX and in the literature of Second Temple Judaism to show that this dualism is unnecessary in the context of Hebrews.

95 See chapter 7, below.

96 Andriessen 1976: 299 notes that “the entry of the Israelites to the land of Canaan was not the passage from one country to another, but from the wilderness to a new “terre habitée et cultivée.” Moffitt 2011: 65–67, 77 also notes the allusion to Exod 16:35. Vanhoye 1964: 250 is unconvinced, noting that in this text (the only occurrence of οἰκουμένη in the Pentateuch) the word is an adjective rather than a substantive. There are variant readings in this verse with several witnesses reading εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην (“into the οἰκουμένη”) rather than εἰς γῆν οἰκουμένην. See the critical apparatus in Wevers 1991: 217. Whichever reading is adopted, the word οἰκουμένη appears, referring to Canaan (Wevers 1990: 261). At the start of my discussion of οἰκουμένη I noted that it is the present passive participle of οἰκέω (“to live, inhabit”). In Heb 1:6; 2:5 it is used as a substantive, in Exod 16:35 it is used as an adjective.

author of Hebrews.⁹⁷ That “truly civilised world” is the ultimate goal of the people of God. It is where Christ is exalted in the present; Heb 2 will show that he is there as a pioneer, in advance of the people of God, and Heb 3–4 will encourage the readers to persevere so as to reach this goal.

The Dominion of Humanity over the World to Come (Heb 2:5–18)

Hebrews 1:14 concludes the catena of quotations with a rhetorical question concerning the role of the angels, “Are they not all (οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν) ministering spirits (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα), sent to serve for the sake of those who are about to inherit salvation (τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν)?” Beginning as it does with οὐχὶ, the question demands a positive answer.⁹⁸ While the Son is superior to the angels and seated at the right hand of God, angels have a quite different role. They simply serve the recipients of salvation. The reference to “salvation” (σωτηρία) announces the subject of Heb 2:5–18, and the appearance of the same word in 2:3, 10 indicates that it is a hook-word tying the three sections together. Hebrews 2 is concerned with those who will inherit salvation. The next reference to angels (2:5) denies that the world to come has been subjected to them and the final reference to angels (2:16) denies that they are the objects of salvation. This, Heb 2:5, 16 form an *inclusio* around the treatment of Ps 8 in Heb 2, both containing a negative reference to angels.⁹⁹ Hebrews 2 can be divided into four parts.

2:1–4 A warning that since the Son is superior to angels, the readers must pay closer attention to what God has said through the Son than to what he has said through the angels.¹⁰⁰ They must not neglect the great salvation that was declared through the Lord, confirmed to them by eyewitnesses, and attested by God

97 Schenck 2001: 428. See also Andriessen 1976: 295–301, Balz 1991: 504; Stuckenbruck 1995: 120; Cockerill 1999: 63; Caneday 2008: 35; O'Brien 2010: 69, and for the connection between the world to come and the promised land, see Allen 2008: 52–58 and Moffitt 2011: 116–18.

98 BDAG 743, s.v., οὐχὶ, 3.

99 Lane 1991a: 44; Gäbel 2007: 364.

100 This is normally understood as a reference to the giving of the law through angels, although the evidence for this tradition is mixed. See Jub. 1:27–29; 4QapocPentB 2 11 4–12 (4Q377); Gal 3:19; Acts 7:38, 53; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.136; Midr. Ps. 68; Tg. Onq. and Ps.-J. Deut 33:2; LXX Deut 33:2; Song of Songs Rab. 1:12. See Schultz 1971: 282–307; Attridge 1989: 64–65; Najman 2000: 313–33.

with signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Spirit, that is, the signs of the age to come.

- 2:5–9 A quotation from Ps 8:4–6 (LXX, MT 8:5–7),¹⁰¹ introduced in v. 6 with the vague citation formula (διεμαρτύρατο δὲ ποῦ τις, “someone has testified somewhere”), and interpreted in v. 9. This section is connected to the previous section with the causal particle γάρ (“for”), which is not always given due weight.¹⁰² It indicates that the paragraph explains the claim of “so great salvation” (τηλικαύτη σωτηρία) in 2:3¹⁰³ and demonstrates that salvation involves dominion over “the world to come about which ‘we’ are speaking” (ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν).¹⁰⁴
- 2:10–13 A claim of solidarity between Jesus and his siblings, supported with three οὐ quotations. This paragraph, again beginning with γάρ (“for”), explains the claim that “by the grace of God” (χάριτι θεοῦ) Jesus “should taste death for everyone” (ὅπῃ ἐρ

101 The quotation omits Ps 8:7a (LXX) καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (“you have placed him over the works of your hands”). This line appears in $\aleph$, A, C, the original hand of D, P, Ψ , and several other witnesses. It is omitted from P⁴⁶, B, the corrector of D, K and L. While the external evidence is strong, it seems clear that the line has been added to assimilate the text to the LXX (Attridge 1989: 69; Bruce 1990: 70; Lane 1991a: 42; Ellingworth 1993: 148; Metzger 1994: 593–94). Several reasons have been offered as to why this line should be omitted from the quotation, but Ellingworth’s proposal that it was omitted along with the succeeding lines that list those parts of creation that have been made subject as not germane to the argument, seems cogent. One other variant reading appears in the quotation from the Psalm. The opening word (τί, “what”) in Heb 2:6, reads τίς (“who”) in P⁴⁶, the original hand of C, P, and several other witnesses. The weight of the external evidence is against this, and the suggestion of Zuntz 1953: 48–49 that it was a deliberate alteration, to refer to Christ rather than to humanity in general, is unlikely as it would probably also require the following word ἄνθρωπος to be definite (a question Zuntz answers by transcribing ἄνθρωπος with a rough breathing, merging the δ with ἄνθρωπος). On this, see Attridge 1989: 71; Lane 1991a: 42; Ellingworth 1993: 148.

102 Attridge 1989: 69–70 translates with “now” (see also Moffatt 1924: 21; Lane 1991a: 41; Koester 2001: 213; Mitchell 2007: 64) and explains that often in Hebrews γάρ functions similarly to δέ. Nevertheless, he also suggests that “[m]ost frequently it does introduce explanations of various sorts.” I suggest that this is one of those cases.

103 DeSilva 2000b: 108; Johnson 2006: 89; Thompson 2008: 69.

104 The reference to speaking (λαλέω) relates back to all of chapter 1. That it is the world “to come” that is being discussed is evident from the expression “in these last days” of Heb 1:2, and that Jesus is in the “world” to come is clear from Heb 1:6a.

παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου).¹⁰⁵ The text now describes God as the one “for whom and through whom all things exist” (δὲ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα), who is “bringing many heirs to glory” (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα). The “many heirs” of v. 10 are equivalent to the “everyone” of v. 9.¹⁰⁶

2:14–18 A conclusion to the chapter developing the claim of solidarity in vv. 10–13. This paragraph begins with Ἐπεὶ οὖν (“since then”), which looks back to the solidarity of Jesus and the children of v. 13 and forward to the inference that will be drawn—Jesus “had to become like us in every respect” (ἔθεν ὡφείλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι) “so as to become a merciful and faithful high priest” (ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς).

Thus, Heb 2:1–4 warns the readers not to neglect the salvation they are about to inherit, and vv. 5–18 explain the means of this salvation (through the suffering and exaltation of Jesus) and its outcome (human dominion over the world to come).

Hebrews 2:5 claims that God did not subject the world to come to angels.¹⁰⁷ But, rather than using his own words to specify those to whom it has been

105 There is strong MS support for the words χάριτι θεοῦ (“by the grace of God”), including P⁴⁶, **8**, A, B, C, D. However, some later Greek MSS as well as a MS of the Vulgate, and Origen, Ambrose, Jerome and Fulgentius read χωρὶς θεοῦ (“apart from God”), with the sense either that Jesus tasted death for everyone except God (as in 1 Cor 15:27), or that in his death he was abandoned by God. This reading seems to be secondary, although it is more difficult. Bruce 1990: 70–71, and Metzger 1994: 594 suggest that it may have been a marginal note that made its way into the text.

106 Lane 1991a: 52–53. I discuss my translation “many heirs” in footnote 11 to chapter 1, above.

107 Lying behind this claim is Deut 32:8–9, where angels are guardians of the nations (Westcott 1892: 41; Wilson 1987: 47; Bruce 1990: 71; Ellingworth 1993: 146–47; Allen 2008: 106–7). See also Dan 10:13, 20; Jub. 15:32; 1 En. 56:5–6; Sir 17:17. Deut 32:8–9 has a complex textual history, especially in the LXX. At issue is whether the reading ἀριθμὸς ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (“the number of the angels of God”) in the Rahlfs edition or the reading ἀριθμὸς υἱῶν θεοῦ (“the number of the sons of God”) in the Göttingen edition is judged to be original. Wevers 1978: 85; 1995: 513 argues that ἀριθμὸς υἱῶν θεοῦ is a theologically motivated change. Philo alludes to Deut 32:8 in *Post.* 89; *Plant.* 59 and in both cases reads ἀριθμὸς υἱῶν θεοῦ. 4QDeut¹ (4Q37) XII 14 reads בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (“sons of God”). The reference to both the “sons of Adam” (υἱοὶ Ἀδὰμ) and the sons (angels) of God in Deuteronomy prepares the way for the shift from anthropology to Christology in Heb 2:5–9, see Allen 2008: 107–8. The association with Deut 32:8 here and Deut 32:43 in Heb 1:6 strengthens the identification of the referent of οἰκουμένη in both 1:6 and 2:5 as the same (eschatological) world.

made subject, the author quotes Ps 8:5–7 (LXX), a text that makes it explicit. The world to come has been subjected to humans¹⁰⁸ and to one human being in particular, although this human being does not enter the picture until v. 9.¹⁰⁹

Psalm 8:5–7 in Hebrew and Greek

Psalm 8 is a communal song of praise to YHWH the creator on account of his majestic name (vv. 1–2, 9) that also contains an individual reflection (vv. 3–8). In vv. 3–4 the psalmist wonders why YHWH should lavish such care on humans who are so small when compared with the rest of creation, and vv. 5–6 explain that though seemingly insignificant, they have great dignity being only “slightly inferior to God” (מעט מאלהים). The LXX renders this expression with βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους (“a little lower than angels”), words quoted in Hebrews.¹¹⁰ The Psalm claims that the human race is crowned with glory and honour and given dominion over the works of God’s hands, works that vv. 7–8 enumerate, that is small and large domesticated animals, wild animals, birds and fish. Verse 9 repeats the opening words, forming an inclusio and providing the context in which the readers can understand the reflection on the seeming insignificance, yet great dignity of humanity.

The LXX of Ps 8 renders the Hebrew words for humanity (בן אדם and אנוש) with ἄνθρωπος and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and while these are normal words for humanity, in the context of the Psalm they refer to “the first man ruling in paradise

108 I will establish this debated reading in the exegetical discussion below. The Psalm refers to the protoplast made in the image of God and commanded to have dominion over the world just created (Gen 1:26); that is, the world that was “to come” for him (Blomberg 2008: 92–93).

109 Moffitt 2011: 120–29 presents comprehensive arguments for reading Heb 2:5–10 both christologically *and* anthropologically. He argues that the Psalm claims that the world to come is subjected to humans (ἄνθρωπος, “man”), but also while the term υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (בן אדם, “son of man”), in keeping with the Hebrew parallelism “almost certainly means ‘human being,’” in the quotation in Heb 2:6 it refers to Jesus, “one particular individual . . . a representative for his brothers and sisters” (quotations from p. 121). For similar arguments see Schenck 2007: 54–59. I will argue that in Heb 2:6 the Hebrew parallelism of the Psalm remains, but while the term υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου opens the door for a Christological reading, it does not enter the picture until verse 9 with the change of subject to “Jesus.”

110 Caird 1959: 49 insightfully suggests that the quotation of the Psalm in Heb 2:5–8 “controls the argument of the preceding chapter, for from the first mention of angels at 1:5 [sic: angels appear in 1:4] throughout the formidable catena of texts in ch. 1 the author’s one aim is to illustrate the theme of the psalm that man has been destined by God to a glory excelling that of angels and that this destiny has been achieved by Christ.” Both Hurst 1987: 151–64 and Schenck 2001: 469–85 demonstrate the validity of this claim.

and created as one just less than God himself.”¹¹¹ This opens the way to an eschatological reading of the Psalm in the NT, and especially here in Hebrews. This (representative) man, ruling in the garden, will rule in the world to come.

Psalm 8:4–6 in the NT and in Hebrews

Psalm 8 is quoted several times in the NT¹¹² and scholars have also detected several allusions.¹¹³ Apart from Matt 21:16, which cites Ps 8:1, all other quotations and allusions apply Ps 8:5 to Jesus, and all read it with an eschatological orientation.¹¹⁴ Moreover, some combine Ps 8 with Ps 110, as here.¹¹⁵ The authors of Ephesians and 1 Peter share a tradition with the author of Hebrews that combines these two Psalms and applies them to Jesus.¹¹⁶ However, the application to Jesus in Heb 2:5–9 is more subtle than in Ephesians and 1 Peter, for in Hebrews humanity is to the fore, and Jesus, the representative man, does not enter the picture explicitly until vv. 9–10, where he is named and described as “the pioneer” (ὁ ἀρχηγός). I adduce the following arguments for this reading.¹¹⁷

The Flow of the Discourse

Hebrews 1–2 concerns Jesus, angels and human salvation. Hebrews 1 starts with the exaltation of Jesus above the angels (1:1–4) and concludes with the claim that angels are sent to serve those who will inherit salvation (1:14). Hebrews 2:1–4 encourages the readers not to neglect this salvation. The NRSV obscures the transition between 2:4 and 2:5 with its translation of the Greek

¹¹¹ Borsch 1967: 114; Leschert 1994: 91.

¹¹² Matt 21:16; 1 Cor 15:25–27; Heb 2:6–8.

¹¹³ Eph 1:20–22; Phil 3:21; 1 Pet 3:22 seem to be clear allusions. Rom 3:23; 8:20; Phil 2:6–11 are also possible allusions, although not so clear (see Peterson 1982: 52; Hurst 1990: 111–12; Kinzer 1995: 1–2).

¹¹⁴ Kistemaker 1961: 107–8; Leschert 1994: 94–98. 1 Cor 15:27 anticipates Christ's enemies being put under his feet in the eschaton; Eph 1:20–22 claims that when God raised Christ from the dead he put all things under his feet; Phil 3:21 claims that the power that enables Christ to put all things under his feet will enable him to transform our humble bodies; and 1 Pet 3:22 claims that Christ has been raised to the right hand of God, with angels, powers and authorities made subject to him.

¹¹⁵ Eph 1:20–22; 1 Pet 3:22. See Fuhrmann 2010: 85–89.

¹¹⁶ Peterson 1982: 52–53.

¹¹⁷ For a recent defence of this anthropological reading see Blomberg 2008: 88–99. Those who read the text in this way include Delitzsch 1868: 1: 101–9; Westcott 1892: 42–45; Moffatt 1924: 22–24; Lindars 1991: 38–41; Swetnam 1981: 138–39; Kistemaker 1984: 66; Hurst 1987: 155; 1990: 110–11; Lane 1991a: 47–48; Gordon 2008: 66–67; DeSilva 2000b: 110; Koester 2001: 215, 220–21; Young 2003: 54; Gäbel 2006: 144–47; 2007: 264; Hooker 2009: 198–99; O'Brien 2010: 95–96.

causal particle γάρ (“for”) with “now.” When the “for” is restored it becomes clear that the paragraph 2:5–9 is also about salvation.¹¹⁸ Hebrews 2:10 describes this salvation as God bringing many heirs to glory through Jesus, the pioneer, and v. 16 rounds off the discussion of angels with the claim that Jesus did not become human for the sake of angels but for the sake of the descendants of Abraham—God’s people. A discussion of the rule of Jesus over the world to come would be an intrusion into this discourse about salvation. A discussion of the role of humans in the world to come is appropriate. Human salvation involves not just humans but the restoration of the entire cosmos and human dominion over the restored cosmos.

The Grammar of Hebrews 2:8b–9

Hebrews 2:8b begins a new paragraph, again starting with the Greek causal particle γάρ (“for”), explaining the Psalm quotation. The words ὑποτάσσω/ἀνυπότακτος (“to subject”/“not subject”) appear three times, indicating that the writer is dealing with the last line of the Psalm quotation (“he has subjected all things under their feet”).¹¹⁹ The subjection of all things “to him” (αὐτῷ)¹²⁰ is comprehensive. Nothing is omitted, although this is not yet evident.

Hebrews 2:9 introduces Jesus for the first time, with a grammatical construction that indicates a change of subject (ὁ δέ . . . Ἰησοῦς, “But . . . Jesus”).¹²¹

¹¹⁸ Moffitt 2011: 59–61.

¹¹⁹ Peeler 2014: 67. I have used the pronoun “their” to render αὐτοῦ, the masculine singular genitive pronoun whose antecedent is ἄνθρωπος, υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (“man”, “son of man”) in v. 6, which I am arguing is to be read generically, referring to humanity.

¹²⁰ The word αὐτῷ (“to him”) appears twice in this verse, and possibly a third time, each time as the one to whom the world to come is subjected. The editors of NA²⁸ include the first occurrence in square brackets (ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι [αὐτῷ] τὰ πάντα . . ., “for in the subjecting of all things [to him] . . .”). P⁴⁶ omits the entire phrase αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, and B, d, v, some mss of the Vulgate and one Bohairic witness omit αὐτῷ. Ⲛ, A, C, D, Ψ, a few minuscules, the Majority Text, the Vulgate and the Peshitta include it. That Ⲛ and A include the word while P⁴⁶ and B omit it, makes the text-critical decision difficult. Inclusion within square brackets seems to be a reasonable choice (Metzger 1994: 594). Attridge 1989: 69 places the words “subjecting all things” in quotes, as a quotation of the words in v. 8a, and omits the αὐτῷ, following Zuntz 1953: 32–33 (although it is not a precise quote since the two words are inverted and a definite article added).

¹²¹ Swetnam 1981: 163–64. The expression ὁ δέ in the nominative marks the continuation of a narrative to be sure (BDF, 131, § 251; Porter 1994b: 112–13; Wallace 1996: 211–12), but it also indicates a change of subject (see Acts 8:40–9:1; John 5:11, 13; Heb 10:37–38 [citing Hab 2:4]; 13:19–20). While the noun in Heb 2:9 is in the accusative, the implied contrast remains, as also in Acts 11:29, where the noun is in the genitive case. Wallace (ibid.: 674) notes that δέ involves the change to a new topic of discussion. In the present context, the topic of v. 8

Not only that, but Ἰησοῦς is in the final, emphatic position (τὸν δέ . . . βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, “but . . . we see *Jesus*”) implying a subtle contrast where Ἰησοῦς is set over against the αὐτόν of v. 8.¹²² Those who read the Psalm christologically read this verse as a discussion of the submission of all things to the Son, alone. This is unlikely, given the change of subject and implied contrast. The sense of Heb 2:8–9 is that while the subjection of all things to “humanity” is comprehensive, but presently unclear (νῦν δὲ οὐπω ὀρώμεν), the exaltation of Jesus is evident (τὸν δέ . . . βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν).¹²³

The Tense Change between the Verbs Quoted in the Psalm and their Interpretation

Two expressions taken from the Psalm (βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον, “made a little lower than the angels,” and δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, “crowned with glory and honour”) qualify the reference to Jesus. While the verbs quoted from the Psalm are aorist indicatives (ἡλάττωσας, “you made lower”; ἐστεφάνωσας, “you crowned”), in the interpretation of the Psalm in Heb 2:9 they are perfect passive participles (ἡλαττωμένον, “made lower”; ἐστεφανωμένον,

is the subjection of all things to humanity, while the topic of v. 9 is the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus.

122 In most cases where the name Ἰησοῦς appears in Hebrews, as here, it occupies the emphatic final position (2:9; 3:1; 7:22; 10:10, 19; 12:2, 24; 13:20). In 4:8, Joshua is the referent, and in 13:8, 12, 21 the word is not emphatic.

123 Those who read the Psalm quotation christologically from the outset argue that the world to come is to be made subject to Christ in this text as in 1 Cor 15:27; Eph 1:22; Phil 3:21; 1 Pet 3:22. These include Spicq 1952: 2: 31–32; Loader 1981: 32–35; Peterson 1982: 51–55; Craigie 1983: 110; Käsemann 1984: 124–28; Attridge 1989: 69–77; Bruce 1990: 72–73; Ellingworth 1993: 150–52; Guthrie 1998: 96–98; Guthrie and Quinn 2006: 235–46; Mackie 2007: 43–44; Thompson 2008: 60–61, 69; De Wet 2010: 113–25. This reading depends in part upon the identification of the term “son of man” with the “Son of Man” of the Synoptic Gospels and John (Childs 1969: 25). France 1996: 262 suggests, “[I]t is hard to imagine that any Christian, particularly a Greek-speaking Christian, after the middle of the first century could have heard the phrase υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου without thinking of Jesus.” For a similar argument see Leschert 1994: 103–4, and his note 98 (p. 103), where he lists previous scholars who have made a similar claim. This is not necessarily the case. As Lane 1991a: 47 notes, (1) the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is anarthrous in Hebrews, while in the Gospels, apart from John 5:27 which depends on Dan 7:13 (LXX), it uniformly has both articles (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and (2) in Hebrews no use is made of the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in the comment on the Psalm. Attridge 1989: 74 suggests that the author may not have been aware of the Son of Man traditions, but this seems unlikely given the claims of Heb 2:3 that the gospel traditions were transmitted to the author and his readers by those who heard them from “the Lord” (ὁ κύριος).

“crowned”). While in the Psalm these expressions describe the dignity of humanity as made in God’s image, they are sometimes read in Hebrews as describing a sequence: Jesus was made lower than the angels (either in the incarnation or in his death), and has now been exalted above the angels.¹²⁴ However, the change from aorist indicative verbs to perfect passive participles suggests that this is not the most natural reading.

The traditional analysis of the perfect tense emphasising the resultant state of a prior verbal action causes problems with this sentence, for Heb 1–2 takes great pains to demonstrate that Jesus is no longer inferior to the angels. More recent work on the perfect participle suggests that the syntax is more complex than this. Stanley Porter argues for stative aspect,¹²⁵ and Campbell, who denies that stativity is rightly classified as an aspect, argues for imperfective aspect, where the action is viewed internally by the writer and unfolds before the reader.¹²⁶ Campbell also notes that adjectival participles are almost always in either the present or perfect tense form, since “description is a natural function of imperfective aspect.”¹²⁷ In this sentence, the leading verb is βλέπομεν (“we see”), the object is Jesus, and the perfect participles, acting as adjectives, describe the characteristics of Jesus as we see them. We see one who is a true human (a member of the class of those “made a little lower than the angels,” βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον),¹²⁸ who is now “crowned with glory and

124 Moffatt 1924: 22–23; Peterson 1982: 214–25; Lane 1991a: 47–48; Mitchell 2007: 66–67; Thompson 2008: 62; Moffitt 2011: 55.

125 Porter 1994b: 40.

126 Campbell 2007: 184–87. Culy 2009: 852–53 discusses Campbell’s treatment of the perfect tense over against those of McKay, Porter, Fanning and Olsen, and notes that no consensus exists on the aspect of the perfect tense. Fanning 2008: 396–97 is critical of Campbell’s approach to the perfect tense form.

127 Campbell 2008a: 120–21. The examples he gives are all present participles.

128 The Greek term βραχύς, like the corresponding Hebrew word זָעַל, can have either a spatial or a temporal sense (“a little” or “a little while”, see HALOT 611; BDAG 183). In Psalm 8 it seems clear that the sense is spatial (see e.g. Goldingay 2006: 159), while in the psalm quotation in Hebrews it may have either sense. If the reference is to Jesus, then “a little while” is possible, since the author’s claim in Heb 1 is that Jesus has become superior to the angels. But if the reference is to humanity, then the sense that the word has in Psalm 8 is more likely. Humans are those who are a little lower than the angels. In the author’s exposition of the psalm, however, the perfect participles, acting as they do as adjectives, would also tend to the spatial sense, even with reference to Jesus. Thus, the quotation and its explanation do not express a sequence, as Attridge 1989: 72–73; Lane 1991a: 48 and O’Brien 2010: 98–99 suggest, but rather two aspects of the Jesus whom “we see” (βλέπομεν). Leschert 1994: 112 suggests that the author may be “employing a subtle use of tense to imply that, while Jesus did not always remain lower than the angels, he

honour” (δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένον). These two verses argue, then, that “the world to come” (ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα) has been made subject to humanity, but this is not presently evident. What is evident though is that Jesus, a real human being (one who is a little lower than the angels) is crowned with glory and honour, and the following verses demonstrate that, through Jesus, God is restoring to humans the dominion over the cosmos celebrated in the Psalm.

Hebrews 2:10–13

Hebrews 2:10–13 also begins with the causal particle γάρ, and explains the purpose clause of Heb 2:9, with the claim that God is “bringing many heirs to glory” (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα),¹²⁹ and the claim that it was proper that, in doing this, God should “make perfect” (τελειώω) “the author of their salvation” (ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν) through suffering.¹³⁰ Verse 11 refers to Jesus as “the one who sanctifies” (ὁ ἁγιάζων), and the many heirs as “the sanctified ones” (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι), who together share in family solidarity, a claim supported by three OT citations, from Ps 22:22 (LXX 21:23) and Isa 8:17, 18.¹³¹ Hebrews 2:10–11

still retains his human nature which he took on to become one of us.” Ellingworth 1993: 153–54 suggests that the perfect participles “present Christ’s humiliation and exaltation, not as a mere temporal succession, but as two complementary aspects of a single work.” See also Westcott 1892: 44–46; Cockerill 2012: 132–33 for this reading.

129 The subject of the accusative participle ἀγαγόντα is debated. The nearest accusative noun is τὸν ἀρχηγόν (“the pioneer,” i.e., Christ), and Grogan 1969: 60; Buchanan 1972: 32; Käsemann 1984: 132–44; DeSilva 2000b: 112–13 (note 56) suggest that this word is the subject of the participle, so that God makes Christ perfect, who in turn leads the many heirs to glory. Most commentators construe the participle with the infinitive τελειῶσαι, and see it as part of a long noun clause acting as the subject of that participle, so that the sense of the sentence is that “it was proper that God, in leading many heirs to glory, should make perfect the pioneer of their salvation.” See Westcott 1892: 49; Attridge 1989: 82; Bruce 1990: 77; Lane 1991a: 52, 55–56; Ellingworth 1993: 159; Gäbel 2006: 151–52; Johnson 2006: 95; Mitchell 2007: 73; Thompson 2008: 73; O’Brien 2010: 104 (note 113); Cockerill 2012: 136–38.

130 For the syntax of this sentence see Mitchell 1992: 688–89, who explains that the antecedent of the relative pronoun αὐτῷ (“for him”) is God, described as διὸν τὰ πάντα καὶ διὸ τὰ πάντα (“the one through whom and for whom are all things”), “to whom propriety is attributed,” and that the subject of ἔπρεπεν is the noun clause τὸν ἀρχηγόν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι (“to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering”). The sentence then reads, “to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering was proper for God . . .”

131 Scholars debate the source of the first Isaiah citation. The second citation is clearly from Isa 8:18, but 2 Sam 22:3 and its parallel in Ps 18:2 (LXX 17:3); Isa 12:2; and Isa 8:17 have been suggested for the first. Ps 18:3 seems unlikely, as it uses the verb ἐλπίζω (“I hope”) rather than the passive of πείθω (“be persuaded”). The word order in Heb 2:13a differs

are important for this study, as they contain language that reflects idea associated with cult and sanctuary.¹³²

The claim that God is leading many heirs to glory reflects the language of the Exodus, where God leads his people through the wilderness to the promised land.¹³³ But in Hebrews God does not simply lead them to the promised land.¹³⁴ God leads them to “glory” (δόξα). This is the “glory and honour” (δόξα καὶ τιμή) of Ps 8:6 (LXX), which in Heb 2:8 describes the not-yet-apparent dominion of humanity over all things, and in 2:9 the present visible exaltation of Jesus, the representative human being. The glory to which God is leading humanity in Heb 2:10 is the restoration of humanity’s dominion. This is the great salvation (Heb 2:3). It is a “heavenly and eschatological condition,”¹³⁵ where they share the glory that belongs to Christ, now in the presence of God.¹³⁶

The remainder of the verse demonstrates this: in leading these to glory, it is proper that God “should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings” (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι). While scholars debate the precise sense of ἀρχηγός,¹³⁷ a background in the LXX is

from Isa 12:2; 2 Sam 22:3; and Isa 8:17. Isa 8:17 is the most likely source, since Heb 2:13b is from Isa 8:18, with the word probably changed for emphasis.

132 Hughes 1977: 97–98; Peterson 1982: 49; Mitchell 1992: 694–95.

133 Schreiner 1961: 2–18; Lane 1991a: 56; Allen 2008: 168–74; Thompson 2008: 73; O’Brien 2010: 104; Moffitt 2011: 129. See Exod 3:8, where God leads his people out (ἐξάγω) of Egypt and into (εἰσάγω) the promised land; 6:6–8; 7:4–5; 13:5, 11; 15:17, where God leads them into (εἰσάγω) the promised land, with the ultimate goal God’s dwelling place, the sanctuary God’s hand established; 23:20, 23; 33:3; Lev 18:3; 20:22; 26:13; Num 3:8, 16; 15:18; Deut 6:10, 23; 7:1; 8:2, 7, 15; 9:4, 28; 11:29; 26:9; 29:4; 30:5; 31:20, 21, 23; 32:12; Josh 24:8; Ps 78:52–54. See also Philo *Post.* 31.

134 Thompson 2008: 73.

135 Attridge 1989: 83.

136 Bruce 1990: 80; Lane 1991a: 55; Johnson 2006: 95; O’Brien 2010: 118. For “glory” referring to the presence of God see Dean-Otting 1984: 50–58; Koester 2001: 228. See Exod 24:16–18; Isa 6:1–3; 60:19; Ezek 1:28; 10:1–22; Tob 13:14–17; Bar 5:7–9; 1 En. 45:3; 71:7; 2 En. 22:8–10; 4 Ezra 7:[91], [98]; T. Levi 5:1; T. Dan 5:12. For eschatological glory attributed to humanity, see T. Ab. 11:3–10; 1QS IV 23; CD III 23; 1QH^a IV 26. For the NT see Rom 5:2; 8:17; 1 Cor 15:43; Phil 3:21; Col 1:27; 3:4 1 Pet 1:11, 21; 4:13–14; 5:4, 10.

137 Ἀρχηγός has a wide semantic range, and its precise sense needs to be determined by the literary and cultural context. For the semantic range see Delling 1964: 487–88; Johnston 1981: 381–85 (who surveys the English translations offered in a variety of sources, and opts for “prince,” equivalent to the Hebrew word נָשִׂיךְ), and Müller 1990: 163–64. Käsemann 1984: 128–33 argued for the derivation of the term from its use in incipient Gnosticism, for which there is no evidence at the time Hebrews was written (Hurst 1990: 72). Others have made connections with the Hellenistic cult of the hero (Delling 1964: 487–88;

most likely, and in particular, Num 13–14.¹³⁸ In Num 13:2–3 those who are to spy out the land are to be selected from each tribe, “everyone a leader among them” (πάντα ἀρχηγὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν, Num 13:3) and all those sent are described as “men who are leaders among the Israelites” (ἄνδρες ἀρχηγοὶ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι, Num 13:4).¹³⁹ In Num 14:4, the rebels deliberate among themselves and decide to select a “leader” (ἀρχηγός) to take them back to Egypt. The allusions to Num 14 in Heb 3–4 clarify that the rebellion of Num 14 is in the background of these chapters, thus the choice of the word ἀρχηγός to describe Jesus here echoes these texts.¹⁴⁰ Jesus the “pioneer” has achieved the goal, being crowned with glory and honour. Through this “pioneer,” God is leading many heirs to the same goal.¹⁴¹

Also significant for the present study is the notion of “perfection” in this verse, a much-discussed term, used in a variety of senses in Hebrews.¹⁴² The verb τελειόω appears here with God as subject and Jesus as direct object. Jesus is also the direct object in 5:9 and 7:28, where the verb is in the passive, with God as the implied subject.¹⁴³ “The law” (ὁ νόμος) is the subject in 7:19 and 10:1, and the former sacrifices offered according to the law are the subject in 9:9.

Knox 1948: 234–35, 245–47; Manson 1951: 102–3; Lane 1991a: 56–57; Guthrie 1998: 107–8 who translates the word with “champion”). A more appropriate background is the word in the LXX, although there it has several senses (Müller 1990: 163). The word appears four times in the NT (Acts 3:15; 5:31; Heb 2:10; 12:2), always as a christological title, and always related to the death and subsequent exaltation of Jesus.

138 Moffitt 2011: 129–30.

139 The versification in Wevers 1982: 174–75 (Göttingen LXX) differs from that in Rahlfs 1935: 236. The verse numbers given here follow Wevers. Rahlfs’ verse numbers are 13:2–3. Num 12:16 in BHS and Rahlfs is Num 13:1 in the Göttingen LXX and the Vulgate. See the critical apparatus in BHS.

140 I have used “pioneer” to translate ἀρχηγός (following NRSV), to convey the notion of a leader, who is first in a series, “providing the impetus for further developments” (BDAG 138, s.v., ἀρχηγός, 2). See Koester 2001: 228–29.

141 Bruce 1990: 80; Ellingworth 1993: 160–61; Johnson 2006: 96; Thompson 2008: 73; Mitchell 2007: 73; O’Brien 2010: 106–7.

142 A comprehensive survey of the large body of literature on this topic is not possible. See Wikgren 1960: 159–67; Loader 1981: 41–47; Peterson 1982: 49–187; Käsemann 1984: 133–44; Attridge 1989: 83–87; Lindars 1991: 42–47; Scholer 1991: 185–200; Ellingworth 1993: 161–63; Vanhoye 1996: 321–38; Gäbel 2006: 163–70. Peterson 1982: 1–20 surveys earlier scholarship. See also Delling 1972: 67–87; Schippers 1986: 59–65; Hübner 1993: 342–46. Paul seems to use verb τελειόω and the adjective τέλειος differently, with the sense of “[a]ttitudinal and ethical maturity” (Bockmuehl 1990: 158–60). See Rom 12:1–2; 1 Cor 2:6; 14:20; Eph 4:13; Phil 3:12, 15; Col 4:12. This is similar to the sense in Heb 5:14; 6:1.

143 Ellingworth 1993: 293, 397.

In these three instances the verb is negated, so that the law and the offerings are unable to perfect anything (7:19), the consciences of the worshippers (9:9) or those who approach God (10:1). Three remaining instances have the people of God as direct object. In 10:14, Jesus has perfected the sanctified ones by a single sacrifice; in 11:40, God does not make the faithful people of the former covenant perfect apart from “us”; and in 12:23, followers of Jesus in the present join the spirits of the righteous made perfect in the heavenly Jerusalem. The noun *τελείωσις* appears in 7:11, which conveys the idea that the Levitical priesthood (by its sacrifices) is unable to make the people perfect. The adjective *τέλειος* appears in 5:14 to describe “mature” people, as does the noun *τελειότης* in 6:1. The comparative adjective *τελειότερος* appears in 9:11 to describe salvation connected with “the greater and more perfect tent” (*ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνή*). Finally, in 12:2, Jesus is “the pioneer and perfecter of faith” (*ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτής*).

Not all of these instances are significant for this study, but to summarise those that are: God makes Jesus perfect (2:10, 5:9; 7:28); the law, the priesthood and the offerings of the former covenant cannot make anything or any person perfect (7:11, 19; 9:9; 10:1); and Jesus makes his followers perfect by the offering of himself (10:14; 11:40; 12:23).

The present context is connected with the perfecting of Jesus and is closely connected with him being crowned with glory and honour as the “pioneer” (*ἀρχηγός*) of salvation; in 5:9 it results in him becoming the “source of eternal salvation” (*αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου*); and in 7:28, as a Son, he is appointed high priest who has been made perfect forever.

The editors of BDAG give the following definitions for *τελειόω*: (1) “to complete an activity,” e.g. in Luke 2:43, where it describes the end of the Passover festival; (2) “to overcome an imperfect state of things by one that is free fr[om] objection,” under which they list Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28; and (3) to “consecrate, initiate,” where they also list Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28.¹⁴⁴ The editors note that this third definition is “a term of mystery religions,”¹⁴⁵ however, they also note that it

144 BDAG 996, s.v., *τελειόω* 1, 2, 3. The editors list five sub-categories for the second option: (a) Jesus being brought to completion (Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28); (b) to bring something to its full measure; (c) to fulfil prophecies; (d) the perfection of an upright person (e.g. Heb 12:23); and (e) to make someone perfect, and while they do not define the sense of “perfect” in this context, they do list the texts in Hebrews where perfection is applied to humans (7:19; 9:9; 10:14).

145 For the connection with the mystery religions BDAG gives four bibliographical entries, dated between 1921 and 1939. One of these entries is the original 1939 German edition of Käsemann 1984, who argues for this sense (pp. 133–44). For a discussion of mystery religions and their similarities to early Christianity see Meyer 1997: 723–24.

is present in the LXX. This is the most likely source of the expression for the author of Hebrews.

In Exod 29:9 the Hebrew expression for the consecration of Aaron is מלאך יד אהרן ("you shall fill the hand of Aaron"), translated with τελειώσεις τὰς χεῖρας Ἀαρὼν ("you shall make the hands of Aaron perfect"). This expression appears with the sense "consecrate" eight times in the Pentateuch and, indeed, τελειώω has no other sense in the Pentateuch.¹⁴⁶ The noun τελειώσις appears seventeen times in the LXX, and twelve of these are in Exod 29 and Lev 7–8 where the word refers to aspects of the ceremony for the ordination of priests.¹⁴⁷ In 2 Chr 29:35 and 2 Macc 2:9 it is connected with the dedication of the temple, and three other occurrences are in non-cultic contexts.¹⁴⁸ Accordingly, the expression τελειώω τὰς χεῖρας and the noun τελειώσις have been seen by some scholars as technical terms (in the Pentateuch at least) for the consecration of a priest.¹⁴⁹

Peterson has argued strongly that any suggestion of a technical term for consecration is an overstatement. He proposes that the idea behind the expression was a "literal 'filling of the hands' with sacrifices" ... [as] the high point of the consecration ceremony ... to 'perfect' or 'qualify' the hands for priestly service."¹⁵⁰ On the one hand, other senses in which τελειώω appears in the LXX illustrate the validity of Peterson's argument,¹⁵¹ as do as the other terms used to translate the Hebrew expression יד [את] מלא.¹⁵² However, the evidence

146 For τελειώω τὰς χεῖρας see Exod 29:9, 29, 33, 35; Lev 4:5; 8:33; 16:32; Num 3:3. In Lev 8:33 the noun τελειώσις also appears, with no direct object, and in Lev 21:10 the perfect passive participle of τελειώω is used with this sense, without the direct object τὰς χεῖρας ("the hands").

147 Exod 29:22, 26, 27, 31, 34; Lev 7:37; 8:22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33. Apart from Lev 8:26 these all translate the Hebrew word מלאים which refers to ordination and is derived from מלא ("to fill"), see HALOT 585. In Lev 8:26, 31 the Hebrew expression סל המצות ("basket of unleavened bread") is rendered with ὁ κανὼν τῆς τελειώσεως ("the rule of ordination"). Perkins 2007 (NETS) consistently translates τελειώσις with "validation," as does Büchner 2007.

148 Jer 2:2; Jdt 10:9; Sir 34:8.

149 Peterson 1982: 10. See also Delling 1972: 80–83; Hübner 1993: 345.

150 Peterson 1982: 26–30. Delling 1972: 81 suggests that the notion behind the expression is that "someone's hands are made free from stain ... [so] that the person is 'able to practise cultus'."

151 Τελειώω appears in non-cultic settings in 2 Kgdms 22:26 (ethical perfection or blamelessness); 2 Chr 8:16 (the completion of Solomon's work building the temple); Ezek 27:11 (perfection of beauty); Jdt 10:8 (fulfilment of plans); 4 Macc 7:15, and Wis 4:13 (geriatric maturity); Sir 7:32 (complete blessing); 31:10 (passing a test); and 50:19 (the completion of an order of worship).

152 The expression πληρόω τὰς χεῖρας also appears with this sense in Exod 32:29 (although this text concerns "consecration" for holy war, see Peterson 1982: 27); Num 7:88; Judg 17:5,

from Exodus and Leviticus suggests that he may have overstated his case.¹⁵³ The Pentateuch consistently uses both the formula τελειώ τὰς χεῖρας and the noun τελείωσις to refer to the ordination of priests.¹⁵⁴ This does need to be considered when discussing the use of these words in Hebrews.

Ellingworth summarises the senses in which the word can be used: (1) telic, in the sense of bringing something to its intended goal;¹⁵⁵ (2) cultic, in the sense of qualifying a person to participate in worship; (3) ethical, removing imperfection; (4) organic, that is making mature, as in 1 Cor 14:20; (5) temporal, completing a period, as in Luke 2:43; and (6) human, referring to someone's death, as in Luke 13:32.¹⁵⁶

In assessing the use of the word in Hebrews with reference to Jesus, it seems that the context excludes options (3), (4) and (5). Option (6) referring to the

12; 3 Kgdms 13:33; 1 Chr 29:5; 2 Chr 13:9; 29:31; Sir 45:15; T. Levi 8:10, where there is also an indirect object. The text reads καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν τὰς χεῖράς μου θυμιάματος, ὥστε ἱερατεῦειν με κυρίῳ ("and they filled my hands with incense so that I could serve the Lord as a priest"). In 4QLevi^c 6 (Bodleian a 20, 4Q213b) there is no reference to incense. Levi's hands are simply "filled," and he "becomes a priest of God forever" (ומלי ידי והיות כהן לאל עלמא). In Exod 28:41, one version of Judg 12:5, and Ezek 43:26, the verb for "to fill" is ἐμπλήγημι.

153 On p. 203 (note 55), Peterson concludes that "τελείωσις is a short-hand way of referring to the ceremony described by the full phrase τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας." He is probably correct, but this consistent usage needs to be brought into the discussion of Hebrews, which Peterson does not do. Scholer 1991: 190 (note 2) refers to the absolute use of the noun in these contexts, and then discusses the "diverse way and disparate contexts in which τελειοῦν is used in the LXX," but does not discuss the consistent use of the noun.

154 Dellling 1972: 80–81; Lane 1991a: 57–58. This is denied by Loader 1981: 40–47; Peterson 1982: 25–30; and Scholer 1991: 188–94. That the word τελειώ (used absolutely) has this sense in Lev 21:10 is dismissed by Peterson as "an obscure and singular example . . ." [and that it is] "too far-fetched to suppose that . . . [this text] alone influenced the writer of Hebrews or that his readers would have made the necessary connection."

155 This seems equivalent to what Peterson 1982: 66–73 calls a "vocational" sense. Peterson proposes that the perfection of Christ is connected with his ascension and enthronement, following his suffering and death, and also involved "his whole incarnate experience . . . but particularly his suffering which equipped him to help those who are similarly tested" (p. 67). All this qualified him to become a high priest. In the final analysis, this seems to be able to be reduced to "the experiences that qualified Christ to become a high priest," which is not far from the idea of consecration, without actually using the word (see Scholer 1991: 193–94). Gäbel 2006: 165 finds Peterson's vocational reading "too general."

156 Ellingworth 1993: 162. Attridge 1989: 86 reads this verse as a reference to the completion of Jesus' messianic ministry. For the ambiguity of the sense of τελειώ here, see Nolland 1993: 740–41. This sense is clear in T. Ab. A 15:1 where "the measure of Abraham's life is completed" (τὸ μέτρον τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ τελειοῦται).

death of Jesus is technically a possibility,¹⁵⁷ although it is unlikely since, when used in this sense, the word suggests the completion of one's allotted life-span which does not seem to be the emphasis in Hebrews. This leaves (1) the telic sense,¹⁵⁸ or (2) the cultic sense. Neither of these is completely satisfying. The telic sense seems insufficient to account completely for the use of the terms with reference to Jesus, and those who opt for the cultic sense usually take other considerations together with it. A combination of these two is preferable.¹⁵⁹

With reference to the cultic use of the word, I note that the expression *τελειόω τὰς χεῖρας* never appears in Hebrews, and nowhere is there any suggestion of a consecration ritual. Moreover, the humanity of Jesus qualifies him to be a high priest (2:17), not his death and exaltation.¹⁶⁰ The ritual described with this term qualified the former priests to stand in the presence of God in

157 Attridge 1989: 85–86.

158 Delitzsch 1868: 1: 119–20. Westcott 1892: 65–67 seems to favour some sort of development until Christ reached human perfection. He sees a process beginning with Christ becoming human, developing through his experience of what it means to be human, until he reached the stage of demonstrating perfection in all that he did. For a telic sense see Moffatt 1924: 31; Manson 1951: 101, 110; Wikgren 1960: 159–67; Montefiore 1964: 61; Buchanan 1972: 31–32; Hughes 1977: 100; Peterson 1982: 66–73; Wilson 1987: 56–57; Attridge 1989: 86–87; Long 1997: 41–42; Guthrie 1998: 108; Koester 2001: 122–25; O'Brien 2010: 107–8. DeSilva 2000b: 112 is also close to this when he translates 2:10 with “for it was fitting for him [God] to bring the pioneer of the salvation of those many sons and daughters . . . to the end of his journey though sufferings.”

159 Best 1960: 285–86 argues for a double sense, the cultic sense of installation and the telic sense of “attainment of the true end.” Delling 1972: 81–84 avoids the term “consecration,” but still argues for a cultic reading. Silva 1976: 60–71 argues for the cultic sense, but adds to that the eschatological exaltation of the Son. Schippers 1986: 63–64 has a very brief treatment and notes that the word group appears “nearly always” in Hebrews “with cultic overtones” from the OT usage for priestly ordination. Lane 1991a: 57–58 suggests that the cultic idea provides the background, but the “specific designation” is “the eschatological exaltation of Jesus as the fulfilment of the promises of God.” Ellingworth 1993: 162–63 combines the telic and the cultic senses, and adds to these an ethical sense, which he describes not in negative terms as the removal of imperfection, but positively in terms of Christ “being appointed high priest, not on the basis of a purely ritual act, but because of the death he suffered, understood in sacrificial terms.” Vanhoye 1996: 321–38 argues from the cultic sense of *τελειόω* that the “main point” (*κεφάλαιον*) of Heb 7:28–8:2 is that there is a priest who has been made perfect forever serving in the heavenly holy of holies and that his self-offering constituted his priestly consecration. However, to this he adds the notion of relational *τελείωσις* in that he is also made perfect in his relationship with humanity, and existential *τελείωσις* in the sense that he is made whole and complete.

160 The *τελείωσις* of Jesus is always connected with his exaltation, while his death is interpreted as the offering of himself (1:3; 7:27; 9:14, 26, 28; 10:10; 12:2; 13:12), a priestly act.

the sanctuary, and it is probably this aspect of τελείωσις that is to be emphasised in the way the word appears in Hebrews. As 7:18–19 indicates, the former commandment is set aside because of its weakness, since the law “could not make anything perfect” (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος), and a better hope has been introduced through which we can approach God (κρείττονος ἐλπίδος δι’ ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ) with “unimpeded access.”¹⁶¹ The perfection of Jesus is his exaltation to the right hand of God,¹⁶² for his followers it is access, through his self-offering, to glory. The remainder of Hebrews spells out the implications of this for them. It becomes clear that their ultimate goal is the eschatological temple to be built by God in the last days.

Conclusion

The first two chapters of Hebrews set the eschatological tone of the book. Hebrews 1 claims that Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of God in the world to come “in these last days,” with the implication that the eschaton has arrived. Hebrews 2 claims that the world to come has been made subject to humanity, and that the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God in this world to come is as a pioneer through whom God is leading the many heirs of salvation to glory. This chapter concerns the salvation of humanity, seen in terms of the restoration of the glory and honour given by God to humanity at the creation, and celebrated in Ps 8.

These ideas set the scene for what will follow in Heb 3–4 where the text makes explicit that this destination is the rest of God in the heavenly temple. I examine this text in the following chapter, along with several texts from the closing chapters of Hebrews that negate Jerusalem and the promised land in favour of the heavenly Jerusalem, the city to come, two alternative metaphors that the author uses to refer to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

Consequently, he performed priestly functions prior to his exaltation. On this, see Scholer 1991: 85–89.

161 Bruce 1990: 80.

162 Attridge 1989: 86–87 sees a vocational process so that Christ is “made complete or fit for his office . . . consummated in his exaltation.” See also Lindars 1991: 45; Thompson 2008: 73. That this is so is seen when Heb 2:9 is read alongside Heb 2:10—the perfection of Jesus through suffering is set alongside his coronation with glory and honour because of the suffering of death.

The Eschatological Goal of the People of God: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 3:1–4:11; 11:1–13:16

Introduction

In the previous chapter I argued that in Hebrews Jesus is seen as the exalted Son of God, enthroned in the world to come, which God has subjected to humanity, something not yet evident. His exaltation anticipates the glorification of humanity, when humanity ultimately reaches their eschatological goal. In this chapter I carry this discussion forward by examining texts that refer to the eschatological goal of the people of God and texts that claim that the recipients have proleptic access to this goal in the present. I will demonstrate that this eschatological goal is presented as the eschatological temple that God was expected to build in the last days, albeit a “symbolic” temple, a metaphorical way of referring to God’s eschatological dwelling with his people.

The House(hold) of God (Heb 3:1–6)

Hebrews 3:1–6 takes up the theme of Jesus the faithful high priest, first mentioned in 2:17–18. The pericope is introduced by a call to the holy “brothers and sisters”, (ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι) “participants in a heavenly calling” (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι), to “consider carefully” (κατανοέω) Jesus, the apostle and high priest they confess.¹ The two descriptions of the readers (ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι and κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι) continue the themes of the previous chapter where they are referred to as the “siblings” (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus and “the sanctified ones” (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι), whom Jesus is leading to glory.² The pericope ends by identifying the readers as the house over which Christ is Son, as long as they hold fast to the boldness and pride of their hope.³ The prominence of these opening and

1 While the reference to the high priest takes the reader back to Heb 2:17–18, the implications of the word “apostle” are more obscure. See Andriessen 1976: 313; Jones 1979: 98; Lane 1991a: 76.

2 O’Brien 2010: 126–27. The conjunction ὅθεν (“hence,” “therefore”) with which the pericope begins indicates that 3:1–6 carries forward the discussion of the preceding chapter.

3 After ἐλπίδος **8**, A, C, D, **Ψ**, the Majority Text and several minuscules and versions add μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν (“firmly until the end”). These words also appear in v. 14, modifying the word ὑπόστασις (“assurance,” feminine singular). Since βέβαιος would need to be βέβαιον (neuter

closing words indicates the contribution of the pericope to the discussion.⁴ It functions to encourage the readers to endure so that they will remain the house of God,⁵ with the opening and closing parts existing in a “relationship of expository apposition.”⁶ One explains the other, and those who share in the heavenly calling constitute the house of God as long as they endure.

Between the appeal to the readers and their identification as the house of God, Jesus and Moses are compared.⁷ Jesus is the Son who is faithful *over* God’s house and Moses is the servant who was faithful *in* God’s house. The structure of the pericope is complex.⁸ While the main underlying text is Num 12:7 (ὁ θεράπων μου Μωϋσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστίν, “my servant Moses is faithful in all my house”), reflected in Heb 3:2, 5, the references to the faithfulness of Jesus and to God’s house echo 1 Chr 17:14 and 1 Sam 2:35.⁹

singular) to qualify *καύχημα* (“pride”) in this verse, the words were probably added from v. 14 (Metzger 1994: 595).

4 Westfall 2000: 190–92.

5 Lane 1991a: 79–80.

6 Westfall 2000: 192. Οἶκος (“house”) appears six times in the pericope (vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) showing that this is the topic of discussion (Westfall, p. 189), and the emphatic concluding declaration (“whose house we are”) shifts the focus from Jesus (Heb 1–2) to the readers (p. 192).

7 The treatment of Moses in Hebrews is in marked contrast to his treatment elsewhere in Second Temple Judaism. Here he faithfully serves God in God’s house as a servant. Jesus has a different role, as Son over God’s house, where he too was faithful. These different roles imply that Jesus is worthy of more “glory” (δόξα) than Moses. 1 En. 89:36 depicts Moses with an angel-like status; in Ezek. Trag. Moses sits on the throne of God in heaven as God’s vicegerent; Sir 45:2 compares him with the angels in glory; in Philo *Somn.* 2.188–189; *Mos.* 2.70 Moses is in some sense divine; in 4Q Visions of Amram (4Q543 3 1; 4Q545 1 1 17) Moses is a Messenger/Angel of God; and in 4Q374 9 3 and 4Q377 1 recto 11 5 Moses is God’s “anointed” (משיח). Many of these texts can be traced back to the influence of Exod 7:1 where Moses is “God/a god” to Pharaoh. This text does not feature in Hebrews. Moses was clearly an important figure in Second Temple Judaism, and it seems unlikely that the author and his readers would not have been aware of some of the ideas reflected in these texts. There is neither polemic against these views, nor the adoption of them. Philo *Leg.* 3.103 cites Num 12:7 in the context of a discussion of Moses’ building the tabernacle (*Leg.* 3.102–103). Thompson 2008: 81–82 finds this building activity to be significant for the understanding of Hebrews at this point. However, Moses is simply a counterfoil in Hebrews for a discussion of the faithfulness and glory of Jesus. Moses builds nothing in Heb 3:1–6.

8 For a useful analysis see Westfall 2000: 175–201.

9 Aalen 1961–62: 236; D’Angelo 1979: 65–93; Lane 1991a: 76; Koester 2001: 243–44; Son 2005: 128–33; Docherty 2009: 184; Calaway 2013: 102–4.

In 1 Chr 17 Nathan forbids David from building “a house” (οἶκος, the temple) for God to inhabit (τοῦ κατοικησαί με ἐν αὐτῷ, 17:4), and promises that “YHWH will build a house (dynasty) for you” (καὶ οἶκον οἰκοδομήσει σοι κύριος, 17:10). Nathan also announces that David’s descendant would build “a house” (οἶκος, the temple, 17:12) for God, and that God would establish him (David’s descendant) in his (God’s) house (בְּבֵיתִי וְהָעֵמֶדֶתִּיהוּ, 17:14), a text that the LXX renders πιστώσω αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου (“and I will confirm him in my house”). This text is echoed in Heb 3:2 which describes Jesus as the one who was “faithful to the one who made him” (πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν).¹⁰ Moses enters the argument here with the allusion to Num 12:7: faithful, “as was Moses in [all] his (God’s) house” (πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν [ὅλῳ] τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ).¹¹ The Numbers text is left in abeyance until picked up again in v. 5.¹²

In 1 Sam 2:34–35 a man of God announces to Eli the priest that his sons would die, bringing his lineage to an end, and that in its place God would “raise up for himself a faithful priest” (καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐμαυτῷ ἱερέα πιστόν), whom he would build into a sure house (οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον πιστόν).

10 This allusion is identified in the margin in NA²⁷ although not in NA²⁸. Πιστώ has the sense of “confirm,” and is a passive deponent in its only occurrence in the NT (2 Tim 3:14) where it expresses firm belief. The word appears in the LXX in 2 Kgdms 7:16, 25; 3 Kgdms 1:36; 8:26; 1 Chr 17:14, 23; 2 Chr 1:9; 2 Macc 12:25; 3 Macc 4:19; Ps 77:8, 37; 92:5; Sir 27:17; 29:3 in a variety of senses usually related to the confirmation or fulfilment of promises. The semantic range also includes notions of faithfulness (LSJ 1408 where the first definition offered is “make trustworthy”). It is probably in this sense that the author of Hebrews read 1 Chr 17:14 when he referred to Jesus as faithful “to him who ‘made’ him” (τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν). While ποιέω can have the sense of “appoint” (1 Kgdms 12:6; Mark 3:14), D’Angelo 1979: 74–75 and Lane 1991a: 76 detect a *double entendre* in this verse with the sense both of “appoint” and “make (faithful).”

11 The square brackets around ὅλῳ (“whole”) indicate some doubt about this word. It is omitted from P¹³, P⁴⁶ *vid.* B, one MS of the Vulgate, the Coptic witnesses and Ambrose. It is included in 8, A, C, D, Ψ, several minuscules, and the Old Latin and Syriac Versions. Metzger 1994: 594 suggests that the word may have been inserted to conform the text to Num 12:7, which contains ὅλῳ and to which there is another allusion in Heb 3:5. Braun 1984: 80; Attridge 1989: 104; Bruce 1990: 90–92; Johnson 2006: 105–8 think it was added to conform the text to Heb 3:5; while Spicq 1952: 1: 419, and Mitchell 2007: 81–82 think that it is original by comparing it with v. 5. Since the allusion is to 1 Chr 17:14 (where ὅλῳ does not feature), rather than Num 12:7, it should probably be excluded (D’Angelo 1979: 73; Lane 1991a: 71; Koester 2001: 243–44).

12 D’Angelo 1979: 73–74.

Both of these texts are echoed in Heb 3:1–6.¹³ They reflect the theme of the Davidic sonship of Jesus claimed Heb 1:3–6,¹⁴ and they exploit the same ambiguity attached to the word οἶκος (“house”) that Nathan exploits with בית in 2 Sam 7 and 1 Chr 17:14. While the primary sense of οἶκος is “household” in both Heb 3:1–6 and Num 12:7, the allusion to 1 Chr 17:14 brings temple symbolism with it, especially as read in the Targums.¹⁵

The identification of the people of God as “sharers in a heavenly calling” (αλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, 3:1), and as “the house(hold) of God over whom Christ is the Son” (Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, 3:6)¹⁶ are significant. The heavenly calling is the eschatological goal of the

13 These two texts (1 Chr 17:14 and 1 Sam 2:34–35) are read with reference to one another in the Targums. Targum 1 Chr 17:14 reads עד בבית מקדשי (ובמלכותי) עד (and I will establish him as one who is faithful among my people in my holy house (and in my kingdom) for ever, and the throne of his kingdom will be established, enduring forever), and Tg. 1 Sam 2:35 reads ואקים קדמי כהן מהימן דכמימרי וכרעותי יעביד ואקיים ליה מלכו קימא וישמיש קדם משיח כל יומיא (And I will raise up before me a faithful priest who will act according to my words and my will, and I will raise up for him an enduring kingdom and he will serve in the presence of my anointed one all the days)—my translations of texts taken from Kaufman 2005a and 2005b. I do not propose that Hebrews depends on the Targums, rather both texts evidence the combination of these two OT texts. On this see Aalen 1961–62, and D’Angelo 1979. Attridge 1989: 109 (note 53) finds these allusions “unconvincing,” as does Richardson 2012: 50, note 144, also citing Ellingworth 1993: 201, who, while finding D’Angelo’s identification of the allusion to 1 Sam 2:35 and 1 Chr 17:14 to be “an overstatement,” nevertheless, suggests that these texts “must be considered in understanding the implications of this verse.” Hamm 1990: 281–82 recognises these allusions, as does Guthrie 2007: 952 who suggests that they meet the criteria of “availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, and satisfaction” in the list of criteria Hays gives for the identification of an intertextual echo. For these criteria see Hays 1989: 29–32; 2005: 34–45. While the author is clearly comparing Jesus and Moses in 3:1–6, he seems to be reading the Numbers text in the light of these other texts.

14 Lane 1991a: 76.

15 See Tg. Ps.-J. Num 12:7, דמשה עבדי בכל בית ישראל עמי מהימן הוא (“as for Moses my servant, he is faithful in all the house of Israel my people”), and Tg. Onq. Num 12:7, עבדי משה בכל עמי מהימן הוא (“Moses my servant is faithful among all my people”). There is a variant reading in Tg. Onq. here, with some texts reading ביתי (“my house”) in place of עמי (“my people”), see Sperber 2004: 998. For a brief discussion of the date of the Targums, see my discussion in Church 2008: 149 (note 21) and the bibliography listed there.

16 The antecedent of αὐτοῦ in this sentence is probably God rather than Christ (Koester 2001: 247; O’Brien 2010: 134–35). The reading οὗ οἶκος (“whose house”) is supported by P¹³, A, A, B, C, the corrector of D, I, K, P, Ψ, and several minuscules and versions. A variant reading ὅς οἶκος (“which house”) is supported by P⁴⁶, the original hand of D, and several versions

people of God described in 2:5–10, the glory to which Christ is leading them,¹⁷ the “true realm of God’s presence.”¹⁸ And while the house of God is probably primarily God’s “household,”¹⁹ given the relationship between the opening and closing sentences there is probably a *double entendre* intended, with temple symbolism not far beneath the surface.²⁰ The people of God are called to share in the heavenly temple/house, built by God.²¹ While this theme remains

and minuscules. The evidence for the reading οὗ οἴκος is much stronger, and it should be retained. Metzger 1994: 359 suggests that the alternative reading may have arisen to clarify that Christians are God’s house rather than Christ’s house.

- 17 O’Brien 2010: 138. For this reading see also Attridge 1989: 106–7; Lane 1991a: 74; Guthrie 1998: 126. The adjective ἐπουράνιος appears six times in Hebrews. See 3:1 (“heavenly calling”); 6:4 (“heavenly gift”); 8:5 and 9:23 (“heavenly things”); 11:16 (“heavenly country”); 12:22 (“heavenly Jerusalem”). In the present context it is likely to be a call to “heaven,” that is, to the eschatological goal of the people of God where they exercise dominion over the world to come. Ellingworth 1993: 198, followed by Johnson 2006: 106 suggests that the heavenly calling is “directly from, and indirectly to, heaven,” but this probably puts the emphasis in the wrong place. Koester 2001: 242 reverses the order, suggesting that the destination is primary and the origin of the call secondary. Spicq 1952: 2: 64 spreads the weight evenly, “the objective call coming from God and inviting to the heavenly life.” Barnard 2012: 178–80 connects the heavenly calling with some sort of mystical experience in which the readers participate in the present.
- 18 Attridge 1989: 106. Barnard 2012: 178–80 refers to the heavenly call as “some kind of vision mysticism” similar to that found in (e.g.) the Qumran Sabbath Songs. I find this unconvincing with such ideas quite absent from Hebrews.
- 19 Attridge 1989: 111; Ellingworth 1993: 196. Isaacs 1992: 80 denies that οἴκος has any temple connotations in this pericope. Son 2005: 132–33 argues on the basis of parallel expressions in Heb 3:6; 8:8; 10:19–21 (παρρησία, ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον, ἀδελφοί) “proves that the ‘house’ in Hebrews 3:6 refers to a priestly community over which Jesus is the high priest, and which enters the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus (10:19–21).” While this is possible, to speak in terms of “proof” in connection with an ancient text is problematic. Moreover, that the community is a “priestly community” is questionable. For the identification of the house as a “priestly house” see Leithart 2000: 60 and the critique of Leithart in Motyer 2004: 182.
- 20 Ellingworth 1993: 197.
- 21 Williamson 1970: 461; D’Angelo 1979: 70–71 and Ellingworth 1993: 195–96 suggest that Jesus is depicted as building the house in Heb 3:3, while Attridge 1989: 110; Lane 1991a: 72 and Isaacs 1992: 136 see vv. 3–4 as general statements about the role of builder. It is preferable to see Heb 3:3 as a general comment, and 3:4 as the development of this to explain that God builds all things (πάντα). O’Brien 2010: 132–33 suggests that all things include “the rest, the glory, and the city that God has prepared for his people (2:10; 4:4, 10; 11:16).” To this, I also add the “true tent” of Heb 8:2 and the “heavenly” house of Heb 3:6, both references to the eschatological temple of the last days to be built by God. (The third corrector of C, the second corrector of D, Ψ, 0278 and the Majority Text include the definite article with πάντα. The article is absent in P13, P46, 8, A, B, the original hands of

undeveloped here, the pericope serves as a preliminary announcement that those who remain faithful will ultimately have a place in the eschatological temple,²² the subject of the following pericope (Heb 3:7–4:11).

God's Rest (3:7–4:11)

The inferential conjunction διό (“therefore”) at the beginning of Heb 3:7 indicates that this section develops the claim of 3:6 that only those who persevere constitute the “house” of God.²³ On the basis of Ps 95 (LXX 94):7b–11, quoted in Heb 3:7b–11,²⁴ the author exhorts the readers to remain faithful lest they fall away from God (3:12). Here, the Exodus and wilderness imagery, implicit until now, becomes explicit as the faithless and disobedient wilderness generation is held up as an “example” (ὑπόδειγμα, 4:11) to avoid.²⁵ The Psalm tells of those who rebelled against God and were forbidden to enter God’s rest, and is expounded in Hebrews to encourage the people of God to strive to enter that rest. The structure is complex, but attention to the verb forms, the conjunctions

C and D, I, K and several minuscules, and the weight of these witnesses indicate that it should be omitted.) Moffatt 1924: 42; Spicq 1952: 67–68; Buchanan 1972: 57–58; Attridge 1989: 104, 110; Mitchell 2007: 82 treat Heb 3:4 as a parenthetical comment, but it is integral to the argument as Lane 1991a: 72–73; Ellingworth 1993: 204–5 and O’Brien 2010: 132–33 show. While in 1 Chr 17:12 David’s descendant builds the house, this text is not quoted in Hebrews. In 1 Chr 17:14 God makes David’s descendant faithful, and in 1 Sam 2:35 God does the building.

22 Gärtner 1965: 67–68; Peterson 1982: 154. The text exploits the multiple senses of οἶκος here, where the sense moves from “house” to “dynasty” to “temple.”

23 Attridge 1989: 114; Guthrie 1998: 129; O’Brien 2010: 135.

24 The differences between the text quoted in Hebrews and the extant LXX text are peripheral to my study, since I am only concerned with the reference to God’s rest in v. 11 of the quotation. For the details see O’Brien 2010: 143–44.

25 Exodus imagery is found in Heb 1:6a, where God “leads” (εἰσάγω) the firstborn into the coming world, and 2:10 where God “leads” (ἄγω) many heirs to glory. In 2:15–16 Jesus becomes human to free the descendants of Abraham from “slavery” (δουλεία, cf. Exod 6:2–6; 13:3, 14; 20:2; Lev 26:45 [LXX]; Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:6 [LXX], 11 [LXX]; Judg 6:8; 3 Kgdms 9:9; Jer 41:13 [LXX]; Mic 6:4). The reference to the faithfulness of Moses in 3:1–6 recalls the Exodus and wilderness wanderings. The wilderness generation and the recipients of Hebrews were in analogous situations, both travelling to a goal (Deut 12:9; Heb 2:10) and both in danger of rebellion (Enns 1993: 272). Osborne 1975: 147–48; Goppelt 1982: 171–72 and Gleason 2000: 286–88 discuss the typological application of the experiences of the wilderness generation to the people addressed in Hebrews.

connecting the sentences and paragraphs, and the repeated citations of the Psalm can clarify this.

The quotation of the Psalm (Heb 3:7b–11) is followed by two plural imperatives. One, βλέπετε (“see to it”), directs the readers to avoid hard-heartedness, which could result in some falling away from the living God, and the other, παρακαλεῖτε (“encourage”), enjoins mutual daily encouragement of one another for the same reason. These imperatives are supported in v. 14 by a clause corresponding to 3:6, explaining that only those who “retain” (κατέχω) their confidence to the end are partners of Christ. The repetition of κατὰσχωμεν (“let us hold fast”)²⁶ at the end of vv. 6 and 14 forms an inclusio around these verses, and the appearance of καρδιά (“heart”) in v. 12 and σκληρύνω (“to harden”) in v. 13 indicates that hard-heartedness is the presenting issue (3:8, 15; 4:3).

The quotation of Ps 95:7b–8a in Heb 3:15 is followed by three rhetorical questions, all beginning with the interrogative particle τίς (“who”). The first is joined to the Psalm citation with the causal particle γάρ, and the other two are connected to the first with the conjunction δέ. These three questions ask to whom particular phrases from the Psalm apply, and the answers identify those who left Egypt under Moses as the ones who rebelled for forty years and who were forbidden to enter God’s rest. Verse 19 concludes the chapter with the recognition on the part of author and readers (βλέπομεν, “we see”) that the wilderness generation was forbidden to enter God’s rest because of “unbelief” (ἄπιστία). The repetition of βλέπω and ἄπιστία in vv. 12 and 19 form an inclusio around these verses.

Hebrews 4:1–11 applies the same argument to the readers of Hebrews, recognising that the promise of entering God’s rest “remains in place” (καταλείπω, 4:1). This chapter opens and closes with hortatory subjunctives: φοβηθῶμεν (“let us take care,” v. 1) and σπουδάσωμεν (“let us make every effort,” v. 11), forming an inclusio around the section. Both of these subjunctives relate to God’s rest: the readers are to take care that none of them are judged to have “missed” (ὑστερέω) it, and they are to make every effort to “enter” (εἰσερχομαι) it. Between these, the author gives two arguments to support the claim that the promise of entering God’s rest was still open (vv. 3–5; 6–11).²⁷

The first argument is based on the reference to God’s rest in Ps 95:11, quoted in Heb 4:3, and read in conjunction with Gen 2:2 where the verb καταπαύω (“to rest”) appears for first time in the LXX, and with God as the subject. That God entered his rest at the creation and that he later forbade certain

²⁶ See BDAG 533, s.v. κατέχω, 2.

²⁷ Attridge 1980: 281; Lane 1991a: 95–96; Leschert 1994: 124–27. The words εἰσερχομαι εἰς τὴν καταπαυσιν form an inclusio in vv. 1, 5; and again in vv. 6, 11.

people from entering his rest demonstrates that God's rest is still available to be entered.

The second argument is based on Ps 95:7b–8a, which opens with the word “today” (σήμερον), quoted in Heb 4:7. Since “David” could refer to God's rest long after the people entered the promised land under Joshua, Joshua could not have given them the rest referred to in the Psalm. Moreover, since “David” speaks in terms of “today,” the “today” of the Psalm still applies to the readers of Hebrews. Consequently, there remains “a Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) for the people of God, which they must make every effort to enter.

The key question in this text is the identification of the referent of God's “rest” (κατάπαυσις) in the exposition of Ps 95, where the noun appears six times (3:18; 4:1, 3, 5, 10, 11), the verb καταπαύω (“to rest”) three times (vv. 4, 8, 12), as well as the pronoun αὐτός with God's rest as the antecedent in v. 6.

The interpretation of this part of Hebrews is dominated by two streams, represented by Ernst Käsemann and Otfried Hofius respectively. The pericope itself is the basis of the title of Käsemann's 1939 work, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, in which he argued that Hebrews was to be read against the background of pre-Christian Gnosticism, mediated through Philo of Alexandria.²⁸ Käsemann argued that the notion of “rest” in this part of Hebrews, while dependent on the OT, did not solely come from the OT. Rather, the OT quotations here served “to anchor in Scripture a speculation already in existence.”²⁹ For Käsemann the notion of “rest,” as expressed in two Greek words that he considered to be synonymous (κατάπαυσις, σαββατισμός), “found its historical origin in the notion of the aeons, according to which the highest aeon, the realm of the divine Spirit, the Sabbath, and the ἀνάπαυσις are identical.”³⁰

28 Käsemann 1939: 5–58. I generally refer to the English translation of Käsemann's second German edition (1957), 1984: 17–96. There seems to be little, if any, evidence for the existence of Gnosticism or even “proto-gnosticism” at the stage when Hebrews is thought to be written. See Hengel 1976: 33–45 for a further negative assessment of any gnostic influence on the NT, and on Hebrews in particular, p. 86 (note 147), and Laansma 1997: 255–57. Theissen 1969: 123–29, one of the main defenders of Käsemann's theory, refers to early Gnosticism, defined as “a return to the source before creation.” This definition of Gnosticism is so broad to be almost all-encompassing. Hofius 1970b: 29–33 finds κατάπαυσις only twice in gnostic writings, both of which he argues are dependent on Hebrews 3–4. On this see Laansma 1997: 261 (note 38).

29 Käsemann 1984: 74. To be sure, Käsemann saw this rest as a heavenly location (p. 68), but reached this conclusion via gnostic speculation rather than from the OT itself.

30 Ibid.: 73. Those who depend on Käsemann to one degree or another include Thompson 1982: 81–102; 2008: 78–100; Theissen 1969; Lombard 1971: 60–71; Braun 1984: 90–93; Grässer 1990–97: 210–11; Wray 1998: 51–94; Johnson 2006: 111–37. See the critiques in Williamson

Against Käsemann, Hofius argues that the background of the idea of rest is to be found in the OT and in Jewish apocalyptic. Ultimately, God's rest, which the people of God enter (Heb 4:3, 9), is in the world to come, specifically in the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary.³¹ While more recent scholars have modified Hofius' position, the idea that God's rest is connected in some way with the world to come, and that this world to come is somehow connected with a heavenly and eschatological temple, has been influential.³²

While the author of Hebrews never defines what he means by "rest," that he bases his exhortations to his readers on the OT, and in particular Ps 95:11, indicates that this text was an important influence on his thinking. Accordingly, I start with this text and then seek to explain the understanding of God's rest in Heb 3–4 against its background.³³

-
- 1970: 539–57; Lincoln 1982: 208; Hurst 1990: 68–71. Thompson 1982: 88–91 critiques Käsemann's analysis, noting that the notion of rest in gnostic texts sometimes depends on "biblical and common usage" (p. 89), and ultimately "was not a Gnostic category; it was a useful term for those who read the Bible with Platonic assumptions" (p. 91).
- 31 Hofius 1970b: 53, 60, 102, 110. Vanhoye 1971: 67–69 argues that this theory is too simplistic. He notes (p. 68) that Hofius extends his theory to all of Hebrews, but really only treats Heb 3–4. I will argue below that it is unlikely that the author of Hebrews envisaged the heavenly temple as a bicameral sanctuary with an outer and an inner court in such a way that the holy of holies can be identified like this. Laansma 1997: 314–16 likewise critiques Hofius' position, although in a more recent publication (2008b: 12) he notes, "I still hesitate over some of Hofius' argumentation and I am not sure I wish to make the referent as precise as he seems to, but I am more inclined now than I was then to view the heavenly temple and its Most Holy Place as included in the *κατάπαυσις* in Hebrews 3–4."
- 32 While there is a broad spectrum of opinions, the arguments of Hofius are adopted to one degree or another by Lane 1991a: 80–105; Ellingworth 1993: 212–71; DeSilva 2000b: 140–78; Koester 2001: 254–81; O'Brien 2010: 138–79. See also the thorough study of Laansma 1997: 10–123; 251–358. Attridge 1989: 126–28 argues for a mediating position between Hofius and Käsemann. Most recently Calaway 2013: 59–97 sees in Hebrews a transition from rest as land (sacred space) to rest as Sabbath (sacred time) and on to rest as a heavenly reality, which he arrives at by reading *σαββατισμός* in Heb 4:9 as "an enduring state of being" (p. 79, see also pp. 62–63, 74–80). That *σαββατισμός* has this sense is unlikely, see my discussion in later in this chapter, and esp. in footnote 107.
- 33 Attridge 1980: 279–80 notes that attention to supposed parallels in other literature can "obscure the dynamics of Hebrews' argument." It is important, therefore, to concentrate on that argument and its background in the LXX (see Laansma 1997: 253–358). Along these lines I note that *κατάπαυσις* appears once in Philo in the context of the murder of Cain (QG 1.76), and *καταπαύω* just nine times. In *Leg.* 1.5, 6, 16, 18 Philo argues not that God rested on the seventh day, but that God "caused to rest," since God *οὐ παύεται δὲ ποιεῖν αὐτός* ("he does not cease from creating"). In *Leg.* 3.169 Philo uses *καταπαύω* of the dew lying round about; he cites Gen 2:2 in *Post.* 64; and in *Post.* 183 Phinehas "puts an end"

God's Rest in Psalm 95

Psalm 95:1–7a is a dual call to worship and vv. 7b–11 is a prophetic announcement addressed to the gathering worshippers. The dual call to worship (95:1–2, 6) is followed by two reasons why YHWH should be worshipped (95:3–5, 7a).³⁴ The exhortations “to come before his presence” (נִקְדְּמָה פָּנָיו, v. 2) and to kneel “before YHWH” (לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, v. 6) make it likely this Psalm is part of a temple liturgy, for that is where YHWH was encountered.³⁵ That the second part of the Psalm is quite different has led some scholars to posit the joining of two different compositions. But a comparison with Ps 50, and especially with Ps 81, shows that this hypothesis is unnecessary and that the Psalm should be seen as a unity.³⁶ The situation envisaged is somewhat like that in Jer 7 and 26 where the prophet stands at the gate of the temple, accosting the gathering worshippers.³⁷

The prophetic announcement (quoted in Heb 3) is an urgent call to the worshippers to listen to the voice of YHWH “today,” and not to harden their hearts like the wilderness generation at Massah and Meribah.³⁸ YHWH loathed that generation for forty years and swore, they will not enter “my rest” (מְנוּחָתִי).

God's Rest in LXX Psalm 94:11

The LXX of Ps 94:11, quoted in Heb 3:11, 18; 4:3, 5, renders the Hebrew expression מְנוּחָתִי with κατὰπαυσις μου (“my rest”). Like מְנוּחָה, κατὰπαυσις can refer

(καταπαύω) to the apostasy connected with the worship of Baal of Peor (Num 25). All this is far removed from Heb 3–4.

34 Goldingay 2008: 88–89; Human 2010: 152–54.

35 Hofius 1970b: 33; Davies 1973: 187; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 461.

36 Hofius 1970b: 33; Kraus 1989: 459–60; Enns 1993: 255–69; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 459–60; Prinsloo 1995: 393–94; Goldingay 2008: 89. Frevel 2010: 175 claims that there are several reasons to see the second part of the Psalm as “a redactional addition,” but declines to identify or discuss them.

37 Weiser 1962: 625; Hofius 1970b: 33; Davies 1973: 192. While this may be a literary fiction, it is almost certain that the author of Hebrews would have read the Psalm as a liturgy for Solomon's temple.

38 The reference to the forty-year period in Ps 95:10 indicates that Massah and Meribah together probably refer to the entire wilderness journey. They occur together in Exod 17:7 (early in the wilderness period) and Deut 33:8 (near the end). Numbers 20:13 refers to Meribah, also near the end of the wilderness period. See Davies 1973: 193–94; Braulik 1986: 37; Enns 1993: 265–67; Prinsloo 1995: 403. In the LXX the place names are translated as παραπικρασμός (“rebellion”) and πειρασμός (“testing”), characterising the entire wilderness period as rebellion (O'Brien 2010: 142).

either to a state or a place of rest.³⁹ Κατάπαυσις appears just thirteen times in the LXX, some of which are not relevant for this study.⁴⁰ Of those that are relevant,⁴¹ it is a state of rest in 3 Kgdms 8:56, and elsewhere it is a resting place. Apart from Ps 94:11 (LXX), it appears in Deut 12:9 in apposition to κληρονομία (“inheritance”) to refer to rest in the promised land; in 2 Chr 6:41 Solomon invites YHWH to go to his κατάπαυσις (“resting place”) in the temple;⁴² in Jdt 9:8 the tabernacle is described as τὸ σκήνωμα τῆς καταπαύσεως τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς δόξης σου (“the tabernacle of the resting place of your glorious name”);⁴³ in Ps 132 (LXX 131):14 the temple is YHWH’s resting place; and in Isa 66:1 YHWH asks ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε μοι; ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; (“what sort of house will you build for me, or what is my resting place?”). Thus, in the LXX the people’s resting place is their inheritance in the land, and YHWH’s resting place is the temple.⁴⁴

The sense in which the notion of rest is to be understood in Ps 95:11 is debated, with some arguing that a place of rest is in view,⁴⁵ and others that

39 For מנוחה see HALOT 600; Oswalt 2002: 56–59. For a state of rest see Ruth 1:9; 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Kings 8:56; 1 Chr 22:9; Isa 28:12; Jer 45:3. For a resting place see Gen 49:15; Num 10:33; 1 Chr 28:2; Ps 132:8, 14; Isa 11:10; 32:18; 66:1; Mic 2:10; Zech 9:1. The merging of the senses is seen in such texts as Deut 12:10 (as an explanation of 12:9, using the verb καταπαύω); 25:19; 2 Chr 14:7 (MT 14:6); Isa 14:3 where the hiphil of the verb נח is used in connection with the gift of the land, so that not only does God give the land to his people, he also gives them rest from their enemies in that land. For rest in connection with the temple see 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 1 Kings 8:56; 1 Chr 22:9. For κατάπαυσις see BDAG 523–24. Lombard 1971: 60–71 and Wray 1998: 52–94 overlook the local sense of both מנוחה and κατάπαυσις and give a one-sided reading of “rest” as a state of repose. See the discussion in Calaway 2013: 82–84.

40 In Exod 35:2 the people are to do work on six days and “do” rest on the seventh day; in Num 10:35 the Ark of the Covenant comes to rest; in Judg 20:43 (LXX, A) Benjamin “stops”; in 1 Chr 6:16 the Ark of the Covenant rests in the temple; 2 Macc 15:1 refers to the Sabbath as the “day of rest”; and in Sir 5:6 YHWH’s wrath rests on sinners.

41 Deut 12:9; 3 Kgdms 8:56; 2 Chr 6:41; Jdt 9:8; Ps 94:11; 131:14; Isa 66:1 (LXX versification).

42 In 2 Chr 6:41 κατάπαυσις renders נח, a word that appears only four times in the OT, three of which are in Esth 9:16–18 where it refers to a state of rest. For “resting place” in 2 Chr 6:41 see HALOT 680; Klein 2012: 98.

43 This text is part of a prayer that YHWH would break the power of the Assyrians, who intended to defile YHWH’s sanctuary and pollute the tabernacle where his glorious name rests. Thus, this text reflects the traditions of YHWH resting in the temple (Laansma 1997: 83–84).

44 Hofius 1970b: 49–50; Laansma 1997: 89.

45 Hofius 1970b: 35–37; Laansma 1997: 44.

the verse refers either to rest from enemies or some other sense of “resting.”⁴⁶ The reference to the wilderness period and YHWH’s denial of permission for the rebellious people to enter the promised land make it almost certain that the promised land is the referent,⁴⁷ whether or not the nuance of rest from enemies is also present.

Some who read YHWH’s rest in Ps 95:11 as a place of rest suggest that it refers to the temple.⁴⁸ In this context, Hofius argues that the notion of rest has three referents in the OT:⁴⁹ in some texts it refers to the land as the resting place of Israel;⁵⁰ in some texts it refers to the temple as the resting place of YHWH;⁵¹ and in some texts it refers to the resting place of both Israel and YHWH; the category in which Hofius includes Ps 95:11.⁵² While questions have been raised about this analysis,⁵³ there are several reasons why the notion of the temple as God’s place of rest in Ps 95:11 should not be dismissed too quickly.

First, in both the MT and the LXX the rest is qualified with a possessive pronoun referring to YHWH. Elsewhere, where this is the case the expression always refers to the temple as YHWH’s resting place.⁵⁴ Secondly, while the primary referent in the Psalm is the promised land, the land itself does not

46 Weiser 1962: 627 reads מנוחה in Ps 95:11 as “peace.” von Rad 1966: 95 reads it as “in the ‘pleasant land’, at rest from all enemies,” and later (p. 99) to “a gift which Israel will find only by a wholly personal entering into its God.” Kraus 1989: 248 combines in the entry to the promised land and “a salvific blessing that is not material but personal, and that has its root and center in God himself.”

47 Weiser 1962: 627; Kraus 1989: 461; Tate 1990: 498; Prinsloo 1995: 405; Laansma 1997: 41–42; Goldingay 2008: 97. See Num 14:23, 30; 32:10–13; Deut 1:34–35; 4:21; Josh 5:6.

48 Hofius 1970b: 35–48; Lincoln 1982: 208; Braulik 1986 33–44; Laansma 1997: 41–45 (cautiously); Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 461.

49 Hofius 1970b: 37–39.

50 Deut 3:20; 12:9–10; 25:19.

51 2 Chr 6:41; Ps 132:8, 14.

52 1 Chr 23:25.

53 Laansma 1997: 42 is right to note that in no case in the MT does מנוחה refer “simultaneously to the land *qua* Israel’s resting place and the temple building *qua* YHWH’s resting place.” This also applies to κατάπαυσις.

54 Ps 132:1, 14; Isa 66:1; 2 Chr 6:41. See Hofius 1970b: 37–38; Kraus 1989: 480–82; Laansma 1997: 39–40, 42. Hossfeld 1994: 39 argues that the pronominal suffix in Ps 95:11 is a subjective genitive, with the sense “the resting place that YHWH would provide for Israel.” While this is possible in the context of the Psalm and its background in Deut 12:9 and 1 Kings 8:56, that a genitive pronominal suffix attached to this noun elsewhere refers to the rest of YHWH himself tends to suggest an objective genitive (the rest of YHWH or his resting place). On p. 461 Hossfeld also suggests that YHWH’s rest has “rich connotations ranging from the land as heritage, to the Temple, to peace with God.”

exhaust the significance of the promise of rest. Rather, the land is to be recognised as a holy place, with increasing levels of holiness culminating in the temple⁵⁵ and, indeed, Exod 15:17 can be read as indicating that the temple as the dwelling place of YHWH was the ultimate goal of the Exodus.⁵⁶ Thirdly, this reading has ancient attestation, with the Targum reading מנוחה ("my rest") as לנייח בית מקדשי ("the rest of my temple").⁵⁷ In conclusion, while in the context of Ps 95:11 God's rest is primarily the entrance to the promised land under Joshua, the temple lies just beneath the surface as the ultimate goal of the Exodus and conquest.⁵⁸

55 Davies 1974: 94, 150–53.

56 See my discussion of this text in chapter 1, above.

57 Pss. Rab. 95:11 notes that God's rest is "the Land of Israel . . . and also Zion," referring to Deut 12:9 and Ps 132:13–14. Ps 95:11 is cited three times in the Midrash Rabbah. In Lev. Rab. 32:2 the text is read to say that while they would not enter (my rest), they would enter another rest. This is explained with reference to a king who decreed that his son would not enter his palace, and destroyed the palace and built another. In Num. Rab. 14:9 this text is invoked to explain why Moses was unable to enter the Tent of Meeting as long as the cloud was there. In Qoh. Rab. 10:20 the same example as in Lev. Rab. 32:2 is adduced, although Braude notes (p. 282, note 1) that "[d]riven from the first Temple they will be allowed to enter the second Temple." T. San. 13:10 uses Ps 95:11 to claim that the wilderness generation has no share in the world to come, as also b. San 110b. Hofius 1970b: 41–47 discusses these texts.

58 See my discussion of Sir 24 (chapter 2, above) where Wisdom rests in the temple. I note that Hofius (ibid.: 40–41); Bruce 1990: 97–98; Hossfeld 1994: 30–32 and Leschert 1994: 163–68 note that in the *Sitz im Leben* of the Psalm, the address to the worshippers at the gate of the temple is a call to hear the voice of YHWH, lest they too are barred from entering the resting place of YHWH, that is, the temple. Laansma 1997: 41–45 is sceptical of this reading, noting that the actual use of the Psalm cannot be tied to either Solomon's temple or to the second temple. Gerstenberger 1988: 28 argues, "we have to read the Psalter as a whole in the light of Jewish community organisation in Persian and Hellenistic times . . . [they] were read and prayed in local assemblies and, at least primarily, not in the temple community of Jerusalem . . . In short at this latest stage the Psalter is not exactly a hymnbook of the second temple but more precisely a hymnbook of many synagogal communities that lived with their hearts turned toward the Holy City but ritually independent of her." Nevertheless, since the author of Hebrews, following the LXX, attributes this Psalm to "David" (Heb 4:7), he could conceivably have understood it as being related to Solomon's temple. That it intimates temple worship may be a literary fiction to twenty-first century readers, but not necessarily so in the eyes of a first century reader, even if he had experienced its use in a synagogue. Weiss 1996: 677 also finds the liturgical association of the psalm conjectural, and makes the questionable claim that the notion that "in antiquity authors quoting earlier sources were concerned with their contexts" is problematic. See the discussion of the "Davidization" of the fourth book of Psalms in Frevel 2010: 184–85.

The verb *καταπαύω* appears sixty-seven times in the LXX, although not all are relevant for this study.⁵⁹ Two groups of texts are significant. Genesis 2:2, quoted in Heb 4:4, refers to God resting on the seventh day, as do Gen 2:3 and the motive clauses for the Sabbath command in Exod 20:11; 31:17. The people are commanded to rest (*καταπαύω*) on the Sabbath in Exod 34:21.⁶⁰ In the context of Sabbath keeping, YHWH rests (*καταπαύω*), and in one text (Exod 34:21), the people are to rest.

Another significant use of *καταπαύω* refers to the rest that YHWH gives his people from their enemies. In this sense, the word is relatively frequent.⁶¹ In Exod 33:14 YHWH promises Moses that his presence will go with him and he will give him rest, while the remaining instances refer to the rest of the people in Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1–2 Chronicles and Sir 47:13. Rest in connection with the temple appears in Deut 12:10 where YHWH commands them to bring their offerings to a central shrine in the place he will choose when “he will give them rest from their enemies” (*καταπαύσει ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν*); in 1 Chr 23:25 where David makes arrangements for the service of the Levites in the house of the Lord, for *κατέπαυσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἕως αἰῶνος* (“the Lord, the God of Israel has given his people rest, and he has settled in Jerusalem forever”);⁶² and in Sir 47:13 “God gives Solomon rest from all around him so that he can build a house for the name of God and prepare a sanctuary that would last forever” (*ὁ θεὸς κατέπαυσεν κυκλόθεν, ἵνα στήσῃ οἶκον ἐπ’ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτοιμάσῃ ἁγίασμα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*).⁶³

59 In some contexts *καταπαύω* simply refers to the cessation of some activity (e.g. Gen 49:33; Exod 5:5). It appears in a similar sense, but transitively, in Num 25:11 where Phinehas causes YHWH’s anger to cease. In Josh 3:3 the feet of those carrying the ark rest in the waters of the Jordan. In Ruth 2:7, Ruth works in the corn fields all day, without resting. See Laansma 1997: 79, 90 for tables listing the various Greek words for rest with their Hebrew equivalents.

60 The rest that the people of God are to observe on the Sabbath is normally described as doing no work, and there is no word for “rest” in that context, although in Exod 31:15 *ἀνάπαυσις*, the near synonym of *κατάπαυσις* is used to describe the Sabbath as “a holy rest for the Lord” (*ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ*). The word *ἀνάπαυσις* appears sixteen times in the LXX. In the Pentateuch it always appears in the context of the Sabbath (Exod 16:23; 23:12; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 16:31; 23:3, 24, 39) or a sabbatical year (Lev 25:4). Elsewhere, it appears in various contexts (Eccl 6:5; Mic 2:10; Isa 11:10; 23:12, 13; Sir 30:17).

61 Exod 33:14; Deut 3:20; 5:33 (here MT reads *חיה* “[to live]”, while the LXX reads *καταπαύσῃ* σε “[that he may give you rest]”, perhaps from a different *Vorlage*); 12:10; 25:19; Josh 1:13, 15; 11:23; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1; 1 Chr 23:25; 2 Chr 14:5–6; 15:15; 20:30; 32:22; Sir 47:13.

62 For the sense “settled” for the aorist of *κατασκηνώω* see BDAG 527, s.v. *κατασκηνώω*, 2.

63 The Hebrew text in Beentjes 1997: 84 (MS B) reads *וְאֵל הַנִּיחַ לוֹ שְׁלוֹה בְּיָמָיו מֶלֶךְ בֵּימֵי שְׁלוֹה וְיָצַב לְעַד מִקְדָּשׁ* (“Solomon reigned in days of peace, and God

In summary, of the thirteen instances of *κατάπαυσις* in the LXX, two refer to the Sabbath as a day of rest (Exod 35:2; 2 Macc 15:1), two refer to the state of rest that God gives his people in the context of the temple (Deut 12:9; 3 Kgdms 8:56), and four refer to YHWH's place of rest in the temple (2 Chr 6:41; Ps 94:11; Isa 66:1; Jdt 9:8).⁶⁴ Of the sixty-seven occurrences of *καταπαύω* in the LXX, four refer to YHWH resting after the creation (Gen 2:2–3; Exod 20:11; 31:17) and one refers to the people imitating the creator by doing the same (Exod 34:21). In eighteen texts, YHWH promises and gives rest to his people from their enemies in the promised land, and three of these appear in contexts related to the Jerusalem temple (Deut 12:10; 1 Chr 23:25; Sir 47:13).

Hofius probably outstrips the evidence when he argues that *κατάπαυσις*, when used in a local sense, is a technical term for the temple as God's resting place,⁶⁵ although sometimes this sense is present. In a few cases, both God and the people rest where the temple is in the context. More accurate, then, is Laansma's observation that *κατάπαυσις*, a "relatively uncommon term . . . is used with relative frequency within the 'rest tradition' generally, and very frequently in connection with the temple."⁶⁶ Given this, it makes it possible that a reader of the LXX would associate at least the noun *κατάπαυσις* with the temple,⁶⁷ and probably also the verb *καταπαύω*.

κατάπαυσις in the NT

In the NT, outside of Hebrews *κατάπαυσις* only appears in Acts 7:49 where Stephen cites Isa 66:1 as part of his polemic against the temple to demonstrate from the OT that YHWH does not dwell there.⁶⁸ Elsewhere, it only appears in

caused his borders to rest so that he should establish a house for his name and set up a sanctuary forever"). Noteworthy, also, are texts in 2 Chronicles where YHWH gave the land rest from enemies for ten years in the time of Asa (2 Chr 14–15), and in the times of Jehoshaphat (20:30) and Hezekiah (32:22) where YHWH gave them victory in battle, followed by a period of rest. Thus, near the end of the pre-exilic period, the rest promised in Deuteronomy and actualised in Joshua reappears in the context of faithfulness to YHWH.

64 This accounts for eight of the thirteen instances. One other instance appears in Judg 20:43 in the context of a battle. Two instances refer to the Ark of the Covenant resting (in the wilderness in Num 10:35 and in the temple in 1 Chr 6:16 (EUV 6:31). The remaining instance is in Sir 5:6 where the anger of the Lord rests on sinners.

65 Hofius 1970b: 49–50.

66 Laansma 1997: 100.

67 Ibid.: 101. Laansma adds to the probability that a Greek reader would associate *καταπαύσις* with the temple, that such a reader would "almost certainly" associate it with the temple in the context of Ps 94:11 (LXX).

68 In its context, Isa 66:1 does not reject temple worship *per se*, rather it shows that the entire creation is YHWH's temple (ibid.: 59).

Heb 3–4 in quotations from Ps 95:11 or in the exposition of that text. I will now survey those verses in Hebrews where the noun appears, in order to delineate the sense(s) in which it is to be read.⁶⁹

Hebrews 3:18–19

Hebrews 3:16–18 asks and answers three questions to show that the people of the wilderness generation were those who rebelled, those with whom God was angry for forty years and those who were forbidden to enter God's rest. Hebrews 3:19 draws the conclusion that they were forbidden to enter (God's rest) because of unbelief. In the context here the referent of God's rest here is the promised land, as in Deut 12:9.⁷⁰

Hebrews 4:1–2

While Heb 3:12–19 apply the Psalm as a warning, these verses apply it as a “promise” (ἐπαγγελία, 4:1), not for the wilderness generation which has faded from view, but for the recipients of Hebrews. Verse 1 claims that a promise (anarthrous) of entering God's rest remains open,⁷¹ that the good news has been preached to the recipients just as it was preached to the wilderness generation, although in the case of the wilderness generation “those who heard the message were not united in faith with those who listened to it” (ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους μὴ συγκεκριρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν).⁷² “While the

69 I do not deal with its appearance in the initial quotation from Ps 95 in Heb 3:11, as this is the primary text expounded in Heb 3–4.

70 Calaway 2013: 65 demonstrates how each question derives from the Psalm and is answered by the Psalm or and/or Numbers.

71 The original hand of D reads τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (“the promise”). The attestation for this reading is weak and it should be rejected.

72 Those who listened to the word were probably Joshua and Caleb (Num 13–14) and those who simply heard were the rebellious people (Heb 3:16–19). This reading involves taking the references to hearing in two different senses. Ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς (“the word heard”—BDAG 36, s.v. ἀκοή, 4b suggests a “message” or “report”) is simply heard, and those who heard “did not have the same faith” (μὴ συγκεκριρασμένους τῇ πίστει) as “those who listened” (τοῖς ἀκούσασιν). This dual sense of “hearing” probably gave rise to the variant reading συγκεκριρασμένος (nominative singular), qualifying ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς rather than the accusative plural (qualifying ἐκείνους). In this variant reading, it is the word heard that is not united in faith with those who heard it. Both readings make adequate sense. The accusative plural reading is supported by P¹³ (*vid*), P⁴⁶, A, B, C, the original hand of D, Ψ, and several minuscules and versions. The nominative singular is supported by 8 and several later MSS and versions. Συγκεκριρασμένους is the more difficult reading, given the need to read the notion of “hearing” in different senses, and should be adopted. One eleventh century MS (104) omits the words τῇ πίστει and reads συγκεκριρασμένοι τῶν ἀκούσαντων so as

promise of entering his (God's) rest remains open" (καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ)⁷³ the recipients need to take care that none of them are "judged" (δοκέω)⁷⁴ to have fallen short of it.

The promise referred to in these verses is the promise that the recipients of Hebrews may also enter God's rest. While the primary referent of God's rest in Heb 3 was the promised land, with secondary connotations relating to the temple in Jerusalem, and while the recipients may be pictured as the wilderness generation journeying to the promised land, God is leading these people not to the promised land, but to glory (2:10). The promised land has faded into the background, and God's rest has a different connotation,⁷⁵ to be clarified in the following verses.⁷⁶

to read "[the word] not united with the hearers". This late reading should be discounted. For a discussion of this textual problem see Attridge 1989: 125–26; Lane 1991a: 93 (note h); Weiss 1991: 278 (note 88); Ellingworth 1993: 242; Metzger 1994: 595; Laansma 1997: 286–87 (note 162); Koester 2001: 270; O'Brien 2010: 162; Cockerill 2012c: 203–4 (note 30). Bruce 1990: 103 (note 4) adopts the nominative singular reading, suggesting that the other readings arose from attempts to correct a very early corruption. This reading is followed by several earlier scholars and by Thompson 2008: 94; Richardson 2012: 72 and Calaway 2013: 65.

- 73 This genitive absolute construction most probably expresses a temporal relationship with the main verb, in this case the subjunctive φοβηθῶμεν ("let us take care"). See Wallace 1996: 655; Laansma 1997: 285 (note 156); O'Brien 2010: 159 (note 13).
- 74 For this sense of δοκέω see Moffatt 1924: 50; Attridge 1989: 124 (who translates with "deemed," p. 122); Grässer 1990–97: 1: 201–2; Weiss 1991: 275; Laansma 1997: 285. Hofius 1970b: 217 (note 849) relates this expression to the final judgment, as does O'Brien 2010: 160, although, as Ellingworth 1993: 239 notes, this word is used "rarely, if ever directly of God's judgment." The sense "seem" is also possible, see Delitzsch 1868: 1: 186; Westcott 1892: 93; Ellingworth 1993: 239–40. See also BDAG 255, s.v. δοκέω, 2a. On this reading the recipients need to take care to avoid even the mere suggestion of failure.
- 75 Kaiser 1973: 148–50 classifies Ps 95 as a "Millennium Psalm" and thinks that the promise of rest for the recipients of Hebrews is in the promised land in the Millennium. This imports ideas into Hebrews that are quite foreign and, indeed, in Hebrews the promised land and the earthly Jerusalem are always negated in favour of the heavenly land and city (11:8–16; 12:22–24; 13:13–14). This view is also adopted by Oberholtzer 1988: 188–96 and critiqued by Bruce 1990: 106–7 and DeSilva 2000a: 25–43. See my own critique in Church 2011b: 54–56.
- 76 Suggestions for the referent of κατάπαυσις that can be discounted are those of Buchanan 1972: 71–74, who reads it as referring to Jewish national sovereignty, something quite absent from the NT as a Christian hope; and of Gleason 2000: 295–97, who reads the reference to rest in Ps 95 to "the right to worship in the temple." This is unduly restrictive, but suits Gleason's argument that the recipients of Hebrews will lose not their salvation if they are unfaithful, but the blessings of God's presence and the enjoyment of the blessings of the new covenant. The warnings in Hebrews are far more serious than this

Hebrews 4:3–5

These verses explain the statement that the promise of rest remains open for the readers of Hebrews (4:1). Verse 3 claims that “‘we’ who have come to faith” (οἱ πιστεύσαντες)⁷⁷ “will enter into rest” (εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς [τὴν] κατάπαυσιν),⁷⁸ a claim explained with reference to Ps 95:11, quoted here in full, and followed by the claim that God’s works had been finished since the foundation of the world,⁷⁹ for it says somewhere concerning the seventh day that “God rested on

(O’Brien 2010: 154–55, note 173). Johnson 2006: 122 recognises that the rest in Heb 3:7–19 is the land of Canaan, but thinks that in Heb 4:1–11 it refers to “God’s own way of existing,” referring to the Platonic worldview, with the noumenal world as the greater reality beyond the material world (p. 126).

- 77 This translation is from Johnson 2006: 126. O’Brien 2010: 163 translates “we who have believed,” suggesting that the context indicates that the participle should be rendered by the past tense. A substantive aorist participle is timeless, although it retains its antecedent aspect with respect to the main verb in the sentence. The readers of Hebrews are described in 4:3, 10; 6:18 with substantive aorist participles followed by verbs expressing some subsequent action, and in 2:11, 18, 5:9 6:12; 7:25; 9:28; 10:14 with substantive present participles, with no such verb. Campbell 2008b: 37–47 discusses verbal aspect with substantive participles.
- 78 There are several variant readings in this clause. MSS A and C and a few others read the subjunctive εἰσερχώμεθα (“let us enter”), and these MSS plus **Σ** and several minuscules read οὖν (“so then”) rather than γάρ. This makes the sentence an exhortation rather than a statement. The weight of the witnesses reading γάρ (P¹³, P⁴⁶, B, D, Ψ, 33, the Majority Text and some versions) and the inappropriateness of the exhortation that accompanies the reading of οὖν indicate that the text should be read as a statement explaining in some way what precedes, see Metzger 1994: 595–96. The definite article (enclosed in square brackets in NA²⁸) is omitted by P¹³ (*vid*), P⁴⁶, B and the original hand of D; and is included in **Σ**, A, C, the first reviser of D, Ψ, several minuscules and the Majority Text. These witnesses are evenly spread and a decision is difficult. I omit the article, since definiteness here would relate this rest to that previously mentioned (in the promised land), but as the following verses show the rest that believers will enter is qualitatively different (Attridge 1989a: 122). This is also a more difficult reading since the expression εἰς (τὴν) κατάπαυσιν is always definite elsewhere (Ellingworth 1993: 244).
- 79 The claim that God’s works had been finished since the foundation of the world is introduced with the rare conjunction καίτοι, appearing only six times in the LXX and the NT combined. In each case the NRSV translates with a different word. See 4 Macc 2:6 (“in fact”); 5:28 (“even”); 7:13 (“indeed”); 8:16 (“on the other hand”); Acts 14:17 (“yet”); and Heb 4:3 (“though”). Here, it is followed by the participle γενηθέντων and, as *LSJ* 860 notes, it acts much like καίπερ, which can be rendered with “although.” See also BDF 219, §425 (1); 234, §450 (3). In this context it has concessive force: God forbade that generation from entering his rest, although his works had been finished since the foundation of the world, as Gen 2:2 demonstrates.

the seventh day from all his works" (κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, Gen 2:2).⁸⁰ This is followed by a second quotation of Ps 95:1b in v. 5. Verse 5 is complex, but the sense is clarified when it is recognised that the quotation of Ps 95:11 in v. 3 does not reiterate the prohibition of rest for the wilderness generation, but shows that God's rest still exists.⁸¹ Genesis 2:2 shows that it has existed from the foundation of the world when God completed the work of creation, and the repetition of Ps 95:1b in Heb 4:5 shows that the possibility of exclusion remains.

Two issues require clarification in this sentence: the force of the present tense of the verb εἰσερχομαι ("to enter"), and the implications of the quotation from Gen 2:2. Εἰσερχόμεθα could be: (1) a gnomic present (we believers are those who enter rest); (2) a true present, with the believers envisaged as entering the rest in the present, probably combined with the idea of progression towards that rest (we are entering);⁸² (3) a combination of present and future, that is, a proleptic sense (we enter already, but will not enter fully until the eschaton);⁸³ or (4) a futuristic present (we who believe will enter).⁸⁴

A gnomic present would be more likely if the verb was in the third person rather than the first,⁸⁵ and should probably be discounted. It is difficult to decide between the remaining options, which can be classified as either wholly future (4), or present, with some sense of progression towards consummation (2, 3). While Laansma marshals several arguments for a future sense, he also concludes that a present-future proleptic sense is not out of

80 The LXX omits ὁ θεός (the subject of κατέπαυσεν), since God is specified as the subject of the verb συντελέω ("he finished") earlier in Gen 2:2. Wevers 1974: 83–83 lists numerous witnesses, which include ὁ θεός as the subject of both verbs, including Philo *Leg.* 1.16; *Post.* 64.

81 Lane 1991a: 99; Ellingworth 1993: 244–45; Laansma 1997: 288–89; O'Brien 2010: 166.

82 Westcott 1892: 95; Spicq 1952: 2: 81–82; Kistemaker 1961: 109; Montefiore 1964: 83; Lincoln 1982: 210–12; Attridge 1989: 126; Lane 1991a: 99.

83 Barrett 1954: 372; Thompson 1982: 98–99; Hagner 1983: 49; Oberholtzer 1988: 192; Mackie 2007: 48–54; Schenck 2007: 61–62.

84 Hofius 1970b: 180 (note 352); Braun 1984: 108; Ellingworth 1993: 246; Laansma 1997: 305–10; Koester 2001: 270; O'Brien 2010: 164–66. Moffatt 1924: 51 proposes that the present expresses the certainty that believers will enter God's rest. A so-called futuristic present often appears with verbs of motion (Matt 11:3; 17:11; John 8:14; 14:3; 1 Cor 15:50; see BDF 168, §323; Wallace 1996: 535–37). Scholer 1991: 202–3 argues strongly that there is no present force at all in this verb (which he represents as a subjunctive εἰσερχώμεθα, p. 203, note 2).

85 Ellingworth 1993: 246.

the question.⁸⁶ While these arguments have some validity, a future orientation does seem to be primary, given the repeated exhortations to persevere (3:1, 6, 14; 4:11). Indeed, a future tense here (we will enter) rather than the present would undercut the appeal to hold fast (3:6) and to strive to enter the rest (4:11). God's rest is the ultimate goal of these people.

The other issue is the implication of the appeal to Gen 2:2. At one level there is the interpretive principle of *gezerah shawa*.⁸⁷ Since Ps 95:11 uses the noun κατάπαυσις and Gen 2:2 the verb καταπαύω, the two texts can be used to interpret one another.⁸⁸ But there is more than this, for as discussed above, καταπαύω appears numerous times in the OT with various connotations. This is the first occurrence of καταπαύω in the LXX and, since God is the subject, the text is significant in that it explains how the rest in the Psalm can be "God's rest." This text is a paradigm for explaining the rest of God.⁸⁹

Numerous scholars have noted similarities between the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:3 and the accounts of the construction of the wilderness sanctuary and of the temple, with the implication that the universe is to be viewed as a temple, and that the temple is to be viewed as a microcosm of the universe.⁹⁰ The creation story extends over seven days and ends with God blessing the seventh day and resting (Gen 2:1–3). Similarly, God gives Moses

86 Laansma 1997: 305–10.

87 This is one of the seven rules of Hillel listed in t. San. 7.11. See the discussion in Strack and Stemberger 1992: 17–34, and p. 21 for *gezerah shawa*. In Gen 2:2 and Ps 95:11 *gezerah shawa* only works with the LXX, since the Hebrew verb in Gen 2:2 is שָׁבַת, rather than נָח. שָׁבַת is translated with καταπαύω in Gen 2:2, making a connection with the noun κατάπαυσις in Ps 95:11.

88 In addition to καταπαύω, Gen 2:2 shares two other significant words with Ps 95, ἔργα (v. 9) and ἡμέρα (v. 8). As well as appearing in the quotation from the Psalm in Heb 3:7–11, ἔργα appears in Heb 4:3, 4, 10, and ἡμέρα in 3:13; 4:4, 7, 8. See Docherty 2009: 189–90.

89 Enns 1993: 278–79; Kistemaker 1961: 36.

90 These scholars include Blenkinsopp 1976: 76–83; Fishbane 1979: 3–16; Weinfeld 1981: 501–12; Lundquist 1983: 207–8; Levenson 1984: 283–98; 1985: 111–84; 1988a: 67–99; Hurowitz 1985: 21–30; Koester 1989: 59–63; Barker 1991: 104–32; 1995: 8–12; 2004: 16–32; Hayward 1996: 8–10; 147–57; Walton 2006: 113–14, 123–29; Beale 2004b: 29–80. The idea that a god builds a temple with cosmic features is widespread in the ANE as Hurowitz 1992: 332–34 demonstrates. See also Kapelrud 1963: 56–62; Fisher 1963: 34–41; 1965: 313–24. See e.g. Gudea, Cylinder B: I 1–7; Esarhaddon's description of Esarra, the temple of Assur, cited in Hurowitz 1992: 245. Enuma Elish I 71–78; IV 141–146; VI 45–81 (see the discussion in Hurowitz, pp. 93–96). This imagery also extends to the garden of Eden as the archetypal temple in which God is encountered. See Barker 1991: 69–103; Wenham 1986: 19–25; Parry 1994: 126–51; Beale 2004b: 66–80; Walton 2006: 124–25. For these ideas in Rabbinic texts see Patai 1967: 54–104.

the details of construction of the tabernacle in seven speeches.⁹¹ In the seventh speech (Exod 31:1–17), the people are commanded to rest (καταπαύω, 31:17) on the seventh day, as YHWH did. Similarly, just as God blessed the seventh day at the end of his work of creation, Moses blesses the people when he completes the construction of the tabernacle (Exod 39:43). Later, Solomon constructs the temple in seven years (1 Kings 8:37–38), he dedicates it in a feast lasting seven days (2 Chr 7:8; 1 Kings 8:65), and with a prayer that contains seven petitions (1 Kings 8:22–23; 2 Chr 6:12–39). In addition to these similarities, the idea of the temple as microcosm extends to the pattern of the temple and tabernacle, with its three parts, the holy of holies representing heaven, the dwelling place of God, and the inner and outer courts representing the earth and the sea respectively. Philo, in particular is explicit about this, as is Josephus.⁹²

Since, on this understanding, the cosmos is to be understood as a temple, then God's rest after the creation takes place in his universe/temple.⁹³ This understanding illuminates several texts referring to God's rest. In Isa 66:1 YHWH claims that heaven is his throne and the earth his footstool, and asks what house and resting place could be built for him? In Ps 132:8; 2 Chr 6:41 YHWH is invited to go to his resting place in the temple, and in Ps 132:14 YHWH exclaims that he has chosen Zion as his resting place forever. Other texts that demonstrate that YHWH's resting place in the temple is equivalent to his throne in heaven, where the notion of rest does not appear, include Exod 15:17; Ps 11:4; 78:69.⁹⁴

91 Exod 25:1; 30:11; 30:17; 30:22; 30:34; 31:1; 31:12.

92 See Philo *Mos.* 2.73–82, 102–103; *QE* 2.68–69, 83; *Her.* 221–229; *Ebr.* 134; Josephus *Ant.* 3.123, 181. See also Sir 24; 50; Wis 9:8 and my discussion of these texts in chapters 4 and 5 (above).

93 Andreasen 1972: 174–202; Levenson 1984: 288; 1988a: 100–21; Hurowitz 1992: 330–31; Laansma 1997: 70–83; Walton 2001: 147–57; 2006: 157–60, 196–99; Beale 2004b: 60–66. The idea that gods rest in a temple is widespread in the ANE, although outside the OT the gods rest after conflict, at times after creating humans to do all the work. The rest is seen as the god taking refuge from the clamouring of the lesser gods. It is sometimes pictured not so much as sleeping, but as indicating ongoing control. See *Enuma Elish* I 35–40, 71–75, 108–110; V 122–128; VII 9–14; *Atrahasis Epic* I i 1–49; and the Theology of Memphis, where after creating everything, the god Ptah is satisfied, or rests (for the text and comments see Reid 1987: 29–31). There are clear differences between these accounts and the OT, where in Gen 2:1–3 the text simply states that God rested after his work of creation. See the brief remarks in Heidel 1951: 127–28.

94 See also Num 10:33–36; 1 Chr 6:31; 28:2; Ps 99:1; Isa 6:1–3 (where Isaiah in the Jerusalem temple is also in heaven); 57:15; Jdt 9:8.

Given these associations the appropriateness of the appeal to Gen 2:2 becomes clear.⁹⁵ God's rest for the wilderness generation was the promised land, with secondary temple connotations; God's rest for the believers (οἱ πιστεύσαντες) is God's resting place in the temple/universe, the world to come of Heb 2:5, which Jesus has already entered (1:3, 6). The idea of the promised land has faded from view, and the destination of the many heirs God is leading to glory (Heb 2:10) is explicated. This is where the dominion over the world to come is exercised (2:5), where God has rested since the creation, and where he will rest forever with his people.⁹⁶

Hebrews 4:6–11

These verses explain the significance of the word “today” (σήμερον) in Ps 95:7, quoted in Heb 4:7, and explained in vv. 8–10. They begin by repeating the ideas of Heb 4:1–2, which claim that “it remains possible for some to enter ‘it’” (ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, v. 6)⁹⁷ and that “those who formerly had the good news preached to them failed to enter through disobedience” (οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον δι’ ἀπειθειαν, v. 6).⁹⁸ That the first of these claims remains true is indicated by Ps 95:7, since there God sets another day, “today” (σήμερον) when he says through David⁹⁹ (long after the conquest under Joshua), σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσῃτε, μὴ σκληρύνῃτε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν (“today if you will hear his voice do not harden your hearts”). As 3:13 (ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, “as long as it is called today”) shows, “today”

95 Von Rad 1966: 102; Lincoln 1982: 209–10; Laansma 1997: 61–75. On the other hand, as Laansma points out (pp. 74–75), the OT never explicitly links YHWH's rest following the creation with his resting place in the temple. That is, the Hebrew text of Gen 2:2 uses **נח** for YHWH's resting, and nowhere is it explicitly said that he enters his resting place (**בנוחו**). Nevertheless, Isa 66:1 does imply a cosmic temple as God's resting place.

96 Attridge 1989: 123; Enns 1993: 278–79; 1997: 359; Laansma 1997: 334; Docherty 2009: 191; Richardson 2012: 71, note 231.

97 Cf. 4:1, καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ (“while the promise of entering his rest remains”).

98 Ἀπειθεια (“disobedience”) only appears in Hebrews in 4:6, 11, and in both places textual variants read ἀπιστία (“unbelief,” cf. Heb 3:12, 19). In 4:6 ἀπιστία is supported by P⁴⁶ and the original hand of **8**, and in 4:11 by P⁴⁶, 104 and some versions. This is the smoother reading, since it is consistent with 3:12, 19, and this, along with its weak attestation, indicates that it is probably secondary (Attridge 1989: 122). Ἀπειθεια forms an inclusio around vv 6–11.

99 This may either refer to the LXX heading of Ps 95 (LXX 94) that attributes the Psalm to David (ibid.: 130) or it may be a conventional title for the Psalter (BDF 118, §219; Lane 1991a: 94; Leschert 1994: 126).

will not last forever, and “may be the last ‘today’ of the present age.”¹⁰⁰ Some equate the “today” with the day of salvation, which began with coming of Jesus,¹⁰¹ although, in the context of Hebrews it is surely the eschatological “today” that began with his exaltation to the right hand of God (1:1–3).

Here, the rest promise is seen from the perspective not of those who failed to enter the promised land, but of those who actually entered it, effectively denying that their entry was entry to God’s rest.¹⁰² For, if “Joshua” (Ἰησοῦς)¹⁰³ had given them God’s rest, God would not speak about another day.¹⁰⁴ The implication is that there is more to God’s rest than possession of the promised land.¹⁰⁵

With the quotation of Gen 2:2, rest as entry to the promised land is redefined as entry to the place where God rests, the heavenly temple.¹⁰⁶ This is confirmed by the conclusion in vv. 9–10, which begins with ἄρα (“so then”): a “Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) awaits the people of God.¹⁰⁷ The word σαββατισμός

100 O’Brien 2010: 169.

101 Hofius 1970b: 106–7; Thompson 2008: 95.

102 Walker 2000: 89. For Joshua giving the people rest see Josh 1:13, 15; 11:23; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1, but this was not God’s ultimate rest, which is outside the promised land as later parts of Hebrews show. In Heb 11:8–16 Abraham wandered in the promised land with his descendants, as aliens looking for a city with foundations and a heavenly country; in 12:22–24 those who have been made perfect have attained the true rest in the heavenly Jerusalem; and in 13:13–14 the recipients of Hebrews have no continuing city (Jerusalem), but seek the city to come. See Attridge 1989: 123; Leschert 1994: 134–35.

103 Ellingworth 1993: 252–53 discusses the suggestion that there is a typological relationship between Joshua and Jesus in this verse. Leschert 1994: 126 thinks that there is “a subtle typological contrast between Joshua’s failure to lead the Israelites into the true rest, and Jesus’ accomplishment of it for his people.” But this is not developed in Hebrews (O’Brien 2010: 169), and Jesus (as distinct from Joshua) does not feature at all in 3:7–4:11.

104 This conditional sentence (εἰ plus the indicative in the protasis, and ἂν plus the indicative in the apodosis) is a “past contrary to fact” condition that makes it clear that Joshua did not give rest to those who entered the promised land. See Wallace 1996: 694–96; O’Brien 2010: 169.

105 Fuller Dow 2010: 173.

106 Laansma 1997: 278–83. Pate 2000: 205 suggests that God’s rest is in “the true heavenly temple or some similar metaphor.” O’Brien 2010: 163–64 equates God’s rest in this part of Hebrews with the world to come (2:5), the heavenly city (11:10, 16; 12:22; 13:14) and the unshakeable kingdom (12:28). For rest in the new creation see 4 Ezra 7:26–[44]; 8:52; 2 Bar. 73; 1 En. 39:4–5; 45:3–6; 53:6; and 4QmidrEschat^a 111 7–9. See also Jos. Asen. 8:11; 15:7; 22:9 and the discussions in Laansma 1997: 106–11 and Son 2005: 139–40.

107 Σαββατισμός only appears here in the NT and is sometimes translated “Sabbath rest” (NRSV, NIV; Thompson 2008: 95). Barnard 2012: 181 equates κατάπαυσις and σαββατισμός and reads both as a state of rest. Koester 2001: 272 translates it with “Sabbath,” as does

conveys a nuance not conveyed by *κατάπαυσις*.¹⁰⁸ It is derived from *σαββατίζω* (“to keep Sabbath”), which occasionally appears in the LXX with the idea of enjoying the Sabbath.¹⁰⁹ While the evidence is slight, the Sabbath seems to have been marked by the cessation of activity as well as by joyful worship,¹¹⁰ and is associated with the temple.¹¹¹ For Hebrews, the *σαββατισμός* takes place in the heavenly Jerusalem (the place of God’s *κατάπαυσις*), where the

Calaway 2013: 79 who suggests that the “unusual ending may reflect its characterization as an enduring state of being, an ongoing cessation.” Hofius 1970b: 102–10 examines the use of *σαββατισμός* in Justin, Epiphanius, Mart. Paul, Mart. Pet., Apos. Con., and concludes that it refers to a Sabbath celebration or observance. See Lincoln 1982: 212–13; Attridge 1989: 130–31; Ellingworth 1993: 255; Laansma 1997: 276–77, 83 and *LSJ* 1579 who define *σαββατισμός* as “a keeping of the Sabbath.” Wray 1998: 81–83 denies this, as does Attridge 1980: 283, who considers that what Hofius identifies in these later texts is not decisive “for the interpretation of the term in Hebrews” (p. 283). Wray argues from the causal relationship of Heb 4:10 with v. 9 that *σαββατισμός* refers to God’s rest, “**which remains available for the people of God**” (emphasis original), which she explains from Philo *Cher.* 87–90, as “an energy completely free from labor . . . with the most perfect ease.” Attridge (1980) comes to a similar conclusion (p. 283). While this could be inferred from Heb 4:10, it is not the most natural reading of vv. 9–10. Wray nowhere considers that the semantic range of *κατάπαυσις* might include the idea of a “resting place.” The relationship between vv. 9–10 is better expressed by Weiss 1996: 282 who suggests that “God lives in a perennially joyful Sabbath celebration,” which is available for the people of God. *Σαββατισμός* is not found in any ancient Greek literature earlier than Hebrews, leading to the suggestion that the author may have coined the word (Moffatt 1924: 53; Spicq 1952: 2: 83–84; Isaacs 1992: 84; Laansma 1997: 276). Hofius 1970b: 106 thinks that this is unlikely, as does Hughes 1977: 160–61 (note 670), given its likely derivation from *σαββατίζειν*. Moreover, it appears as a variant reading in Plutarch, *Superstition*, 166 (Plutarch 1927–1976: 2: 460, note 1), which is unlikely to be dependent upon Hebrews (Attridge 1989: 131), although the MS tradition could have been influenced by other works influenced in turn by Hebrews.

108 Käsemann 1984: 68–75 equates *κατάπαυσις*, *σαββατισμός* and *ἑβδομος* (seventh) and finds the background of the rest in Heb 3–4 in gnostic speculation about the seventh aeon. But in Heb 4, the seventh (*ἑβδομος*) day is simply introduced to set the context of God’s rest in Gen 2:2, and *κατάπαυσις* and *σαββατισμός* are not synonymous. See the critiques of Käsemann’s reading in Hofius 1970b: 102–6 and Laansma 1997: 320–21.

109 Lev 26:34–35; 1 Esd 1:55. *Σαββατίζω* also appears in Exod 16:30; Lev 23:32; 2 Chr 26:31; 2 Macc 6:6.

110 Andreasen 1972: 141–50. See Ps 92:1 (MT); 2 Macc 8:27; Jub. 50:9; LAB 11:8; 1 En. 41:7; 63:5.

111 Laansma 1997: 283. For Sabbath celebration related to the temple see Lev 23:3, where the Sabbath is described as *קדשׁ מוקרא* (“a holy assembly”); Num 28:9–10 and Ezek 46:4–5 where sacrifices are offered on the Sabbath. See also 2 Kings 11:4–12; 16:17; Isa 1:10–14; Lam 2:6; Ezek 22:8, 26; 23:38; 45:17. On this see Laansma *ibid.*: 68–69; Walton 2001: 153.

people join “with myriads of angels in joyful worship” (μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει, 12:22).¹¹²

Verse 10 (beginning with γάρ) gives a reason for the claim that a Sabbath celebration awaits the people of God. That is, Jesus has entered God’s resting place and ceased from his work (of purification from sin, 1:3),¹¹³ just as God entered his resting place, having ceased from his work (of creation, 4:3–4). The nominative absolute construction in the first half of the verse (ὁ γάρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατὰπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, “for as for the one who has entered his [God’s] resting place”)¹¹⁴ places the emphasis on the subject, and gives a fresh perspective on the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God—this was his entry into God’s rest. The second part of the verse expands on this: “he [Jesus] himself has rested from his work as God did from his” (καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ θεός). For this reason a Sabbath rest for believers remains open (v. 9). The verse, then, gives a christological conclusion to the discussion of God’s rest and connects it with the exaltation of Jesus as “pioneer” (ἀρχηγός, 2:10). Jesus has entered God’s rest, having ceased from his labours. In v. 11 the believers are encouraged to do the same. They are to “make every effort” (σπουδάζω)¹¹⁵ “to enter that resting place” (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατὰπαυσιν), that is, God’s resting place of Gen 2:2; Ps 95:11. Then, God, Jesus and the believers will rest together in the “great sabbath celebration around God’s throne.”¹¹⁶

¹¹² Son 2005: 138–40; Schenck 2007: 62–63.

¹¹³ Here I follow Moore 2014: 1–18 in giving a christological reading of Heb 4:10. See also Sabourin 1973: 204, and Attridge 1989: 131, who suggests this reading as a possibility. The aorist indicative (κατέπαυσεν) needs to be given its normal past time reference as in the other two instances of this word in Hebrews, 4:4, 8 (Moore, pp. 5–6). Those who see a reference to believers entering God’s rest in this verse suggest a gnomic aorist, expressing a general (timeless) concept (Ellingworth 1993: 256) or perhaps a proleptic aorist, expressing certainty (Wallace 1996: 564). I am persuaded by Moore’s argumentation, which need not be repeated here, although reading the verse as referring to believers entering God’s rest in the eschaton is not prejudicial to my argument.

¹¹⁴ The antecedent of the genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ in the phrase εἰς τὴν κατὰπαυσιν αὐτοῦ is ambiguous, but is best understood as God’s resting place (NRSV; Bruce 1990: 109; Lane 1991a: 93; Ellingworth 1993: 257; Enns 1997: 360; Koester 2001: 279; O’Brien 2010: 171) rather than Jesus’s resting place.

¹¹⁵ BDAG 939. The word here is a hortatory subjunctive as the author includes himself in the appeal.

¹¹⁶ O’Brien 2010: 172. See the similar ideas in Rev 13:14.

Conclusion

This pericope (3:7–4:11) clarifies that the goal of those whom God is leading to glory (2:10) is the resting place that God entered at the creation, in the temple/universe that God had created (Gen 1:1–2:3). It also clarifies that the promised land (and by implication the Jerusalem temple) was not God's ultimate resting place. That still awaits "the believers" (οἱ πιστεύσαντες, 4:3, that is, "God's people," ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 9). Later this rest will be identified as the true tent pitched by the Lord (8:2), the heavenly Jerusalem (12:22) and the city to come (13:13–14). The referent of all these expressions is the same: it is the world to come of Heb 2:5, already occupied by Jesus (1:6) and ultimately to be subjected to those who persevere and, therefore, enter it.¹¹⁷

A City with Foundations (Heb 11:8–16)

The long central section of Hebrews ends with three exhortations. The readers are to approach God (10:22), to hold on to their confession (10:23) and to find ways to stimulate love and good deeds in the community (10:24). These exhortations are followed by a warning that God's judgment awaits those who persist in deliberate sin (vv. 26–31), followed in turn by an appeal to the readers to recall how they had endured in the past and not to abandon their confidence, which leads to great reward (μισθαποδοσία v. 35). The paragraph ends with a quotation from Hab 2:3–4 (LXX), conflated with three words from Isa 26:20 to establish that the coming one will come in a little while and not delay, and that the righteous one will live by "faith" (πίστις), because God has no pleasure in those who shrink back. Verse 36 leads into the Habakkuk quotation, explaining that they need "endurance" (ὑπομονή), so that, having done the will of God they will "receive" (χομίζω) the "promise" (ἐπαγγελία). The chapter ends with the declaration that "we" (the author and readers) are not those who shrink back

117 Cf. DeSilva 2000b: 397 (note 47). "The author skilfully changes and develops the images for the final destiny of the believers and the content of the promise as the context of his discussion changes. Thus in chapters 3 and 4 in the context of the example of the wilderness generation, the promise is conceived of as 'rest'; in the context of the presentation of Jesus' work and the hearers' advantage in cultic imagery the goal becomes the heavenly 'holy of holies.' Now [11:10], as the author more directly addresses the believers' experience of loss and abuse in their current city, the image is again transformed into a secure city and homeland where they shall enjoy perpetual honor in God's presence." Loader 1981: 52; Lincoln 1982: 209; Thompson 2008: 96 express similar ideas.

and are lost, but rather those who have “faith” (πίστις) and preserve their lives. In what follows I will discuss the identification of the reward that the faithful will receive.

Several words in these verses reappear in significant places in Heb 11:1–12:7, indicating that Heb 11 cannot be detached from Heb 10 and 12,¹¹⁸ and confirming the judgment of Schenck that Heb 11 functions as an indirect exhortation to the readers to remain faithful.¹¹⁹ The substantive ὑπομονή (“endurance”), appears only twice in Hebrews (10:36; 12:1) and the verb ὑπομένω (“to endure”) four times (10:32; 12:2, 3, 7). While μισθαποδοσία (“reward”) appears in 2:2 in terms of a penalty for transgression, it also appears in 10:35 claiming that the readers’ confidence will lead to a reward, and in 11:26 where Moses remained faithful, anticipating the reward. The substantive ἐπαγγελία (“promise”) appears fourteen times in Hebrews,¹²⁰ seven of which occur between Heb 10:35–11:39, and two of which (10:36; 11:39) are juxtaposed with the verb κομίζω (“to receive, possess”). Finally, the substantive πίστις (“faith”) is common in Hebrews, appearing thirty-two times, with all but five of these between Heb 10:38–12:2. These words indicate the thrust of Heb 10:32–12:7: with faith and endurance the readers will receive the promised reward.

Thus the faith that is the subject of Heb 11 has a future orientation, as the opening definition that informs the rest of the chapter maintains. Hebrews 11:1 explains that faith is the “reality” (ὑπόστασις) of what is hoped for and the

118 Thompson 1982: 69; 2008: 228–29; Cosby 1988: 260; Attridge 1989: 305–6; Hamm 1990: 279–80; Lane 1991b: 312–24; DeSilva 2000b: 377; Johnson 2006: 275; O’Brien 2010: 394–95; Richardson 2012: 119–20. Note the conjunction δέ in 11:1 tying Heb 11 with what precedes and τοιγαροῦν (“therefore”) in 12:1 tying Heb 12 to Heb 11. It can be misleading to read Heb 11 apart from these preceding and following texts as does Käsemann 1984: 184–85.

119 Schenck 2007: 28.

120 Heb 4:1; 6:12, 15, 17; 7:6, 8:6; 9:15; 10:36; 11:9, 13, 17, 33, 39. The concentration of promise language in this chapter is reminiscent of 4:1–2, where the readers are to take care not to fail to reach God’s rest, as did the wilderness generation, while the promise of entering it remains. That Rahab completes the list of faithful people (at the time of the conquest), carries the implication that none of these faithful people entered the promised rest of Ps 95, that is, the land of Canaan. Hebrews 11 compares and contrasts the faithful people who endured and will ultimately enter God’s rest with the unfaithful people of Heb 3 who did not and will not. Nevertheless, while the content of Heb 3–4 and 11 can be compared in this way, there is little specific vocabulary to indicate that. The implications simmer below the surface (see Ellingworth 1993: 563).

“verification” (ἐλεγχος) of what is unseen,¹²¹ unseen, that is, because it is still future (11:7, 13).¹²² In 12:2, Jesus the supreme exemplar of faith, like those in the catalogue of faithful people in Heb 11,¹²³ endured and has now received his eschatological reward, having taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God. The “unseen things” (πράγματα . . . οὐ βλεπόμενα) of Heb 11:1 are to be correlated with the unseen subjection of the world to come to humanity in Heb 2:8, and the “things” (πράγματα) that the law has a foreshadowing of in Heb 10:1; that is, the blessings of the new age. And, while the patriarchs saw and greeted the promised blessings from afar (11:13), the subjection of the world to come to humanity is not yet apparent.¹²⁴ The exaltation of Christ, visible to all now through faith (Heb 2:9), is the “reality” (ὑπόστασις) of what is hoped for and the “verification” (ἐλεγχος) of this unseen subjection of all things.¹²⁵

This catalogue of faithful people who endured without receiving the promises is uneven. Some are treated in single sentences (Abel, v. 4; Enoch, v. 5; Noah, v. 7; Rahab, v. 31; Joseph, v. 22)¹²⁶ and others given an extended treatment. Abraham and the Patriarchs feature in vv. 8–22 and Moses in vv. 23–28. While the Exodus and conquest are mentioned in vv. 29–30, no names are

121 It is beyond my scope to enter into discussion of the complex translation problems surrounding Heb 11:1. The glosses “reality” and “verification” are from Attridge 1989: 309–10 (see his entire discussion on pp. 307–11). For a discussion of ὑπόστασις in Hebrews (also arguing for the sense of “reality”) see Koester 1972: 585–88 and, for more recent discussion of both words, with similar conclusions, see Lane 1991b: 325–26; 28–29; Baugh 2006: 113–18; Bockmuehl 2009: 371; O’Brien 2010: 398–400. Richardson 2012: 119–29 has a full discussion and concludes that ὑπόστασις and ἐλεγχος are near synonyms, with the sense “steadfast confidence” and “certainty” respectively.

122 Williamson 1970: 340; Lane 1991b: 329; Eisenbaum 1997: 384–86; Koester 2001: 473; Baugh 2006: 121; Moberly 2009: 354. This eschatological orientation does not exhaust the ideas in the chapter, as vv. 3, 27 indicate (Attridge 1989: 311; Gordon 2008: 149–50). Thompson 1982: 73–79; 2008: 231 draws a line between the things hoped for (eschatology) and the unseen things belonging to “the Platonic distinction between the visible and the invisible world,” as does Johnson 2006: 277. But as Ellingworth 1993: 562–63 and Rhee 2001: 31–34 demonstrate such a distinction is absent from Heb 11.

123 For similar lists of heroes from the past see Wis 10; Sir 44–50; 4 Macc 16:16–23. See also the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 560–61. Cosby 1988: 257–73 discusses the use of anaphora in this chapter, and Richardson 2012: 167–224 comprehensively demonstrates how those mentioned in Heb 11 function as typological anticipations of Jesus in 12:1–2.

124 Cf. Brawley 1993: 95: “In spite of the appearance of present circumstances, faith is a conviction about the consummation of divine victory now withheld from human eyes.”

125 Ibid.: 97.

126 I exclude Isaac and Jacob, who also receive one sentence each (vv. 21–22), as they are subsumed under Abraham in vv. 9, 13–16, see Hamm 1990: 277.

given apart from Rahab,¹²⁷ followed by a brief eight-verse summary naming a few people in passing, and a two-verse conclusion.¹²⁸

The extended treatment given to Abraham indicates his significance. Three incidents from his life are mentioned: his journey to the land of promise while unaware of his destination, and his sojourn there as an alien with Isaac and Jacob; his ability along with Sarah to procreate when old; and the *Aqedah*. The eschatological orientation of Abraham's faith is clear in the first incident, defined in terms of three locales: the place to which he travelled, the land where he sojourned and the country he anticipated.¹²⁹ At the outset he travelled "to a place he was about to receive as an inheritance" (εἰς τόπον ὃν ἤμελλεν λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν).¹³⁰ He arrived in "a land of promise" (γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), living there as an "alien" (παροικέω) with Isaac and Jacob (Gen 23:4), heirs with him of the same "promise" (ἐπαγγελία), as though living in

127 Mosser 2009a: 384–86, 394–95 discusses the place of Rahab, the Gentile woman prostitute at the end of a list of the illustrious figures of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses, and argues that she is rhetorical centre of the chapter. The mention of Rahab is even more surprising in connection with the conquest of Canaan, since Joshua is absent from the list, although he does appear in 4:8 in a claim that he did not give the people the rest God had promised. As Johnson 2006: 290–91 suggests, this amounts to a critique of Joshua along with the wilderness generation for "seeing the land of Canaan as 'God's rest' in the first place." Moreover, Rahab did not perish with the disobedient (ἀπειθέω, see 3:18). Significantly, while the author has time to refer to Rahab, he has insufficient time to mention Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel and the prophets.

128 For a discussion of the rhetorical composition and the function of Heb 11 in the book see Cosby 1988: 258–73, who concludes that the "rhetorical techniques reinforce the actual evidence presented to validate the author's claim that those who please God are the ones who ignore earthly blessing and live their lives in the glorious hope of the promised heavenly rest." For similar assessments see D'Angelo 1979: 24–26; Lane 1991b: 319; Schenck 2007: 28; O'Brien 2010: 395–96.

129 Apart from leaving in obedience to God, Abraham and the Patriarchs do not move, Abraham goes to "receive" (λαμβάνω) an inheritance; he "awaits" (ἐκδέχομαι) the city with foundations; he and the others "see" (εἶδον) and "greet" (ἀσπάζομαι) the (contents of) the promises; they "seek" (ἐπιζητέω) a homeland; and they "aspire to" (ὀρέγω) a better country. Thus, they are not pilgrims migrating towards heaven (after death) as Käsemann 1984: 32–37, 48–55 and Johnsson 1978: 245 suggest. Rather they anticipate the appearance of the city (Lane 1991b: 358–59).

130 The second correctors of $\aleph$ and D, and several minuscules add the definite article to τόπος in this verse. It is absent from P⁴⁶, the original hands of $\aleph$ and D, and from A, P, Ψ and several other minuscules. Adding the article may suggest that copyists were thinking of Canaan, but as the sequel shows, Canaan is not "the place." See Lane 1991b: 349; Ellingworth 1993: 581–82; Koester 2001: 484; Schenck 2007: 63–64.

a “foreign land” (ἀλλότριος).¹³¹ However, they were well aware this was not their ultimate goal, for while they “camped” there (ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας),¹³² they were waiting for “the city with foundations” (ἡ τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλις),¹³³ whose “maker” (τεχνίτης) and “builder” (δημιουργός) is God.¹³⁴ The description of the city as being constructed and built by God is initially reminiscent of Heb 3:4, where the one who builds all things is God (although the word there is κατασκευάζω, “prepare”), but more pertinent is Heb 8:2, where the true tent is “pitched” (πήγνυμι) by the Lord. Hebrews 11:10 is another text reflecting God’s intention to dwell with his people in the eschaton, this time not so much in a

-
- 131 To claim that the author of Hebrews has a negative view of created things and a positive view of the unseen world, is to misread the text. Nonetheless, in 11:9–10 he does treat the “land of promise” (γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) with a degree of disdain, matching the suggestion of 4:8 that Joshua did not lead the people into God’s rest. The contrast is not between inferior earthly things and superior heavenly things, but between the eschatological dwelling place of God and the earthly territory that pointed to that reality. There can no longer be any attachment to that land, contra Buchanan 1972: 191–94 who thinks the goal is the earthly land, which is only metaphorically heavenly (see Attridge 1989: 329, note 12).
- 132 Only here in the NT does σκηνή refer to a temporary human dwelling. See Matt 17:4; Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33 (the transfiguration); Luke 16:9 (eternal homes); Acts 7:43–44 (the tabernacle); Acts 15:16 (the fallen tent of David); Heb 8:2, 5; 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 21; 13:10 (the temple, or the earthly or heavenly tabernacle); Rev 13:6; 15:5 (the tabernacle in heaven); 21:3 (the eternal dwelling place of God with his people).
- 133 This is the first occurrence of πόλις (“city”) in Hebrews. The word appears three more times (11:16 in an emphatic position at the end of a paragraph; 12:22; 13:14). In 11:16; 12:22 the heavenly city is in view, and in 13:14, the earthly city (Jerusalem) is negated in a similar way that the land is negated in 11:9. Bruce 1990: 299 refers to Canaan and Jerusalem as “temporary object lessons.” Only here does one of the places referred to in vv. 8–10 have the definite article. This city is “the” place over against other places.
- 134 Philo juxtaposes τεχνίτης and δημιουργός in several places, sometimes referring to builders generally (*Leg.* 3.98; *Cher.* 126; *Contempl.* 4–5; *Prov.* 2.15–16) and sometimes referring to God as a builder (*Leg.* 3.99; *Cher.* 127–128; *Gig.* 23; *Deus* 21, 25, 30, 31; *Congr.* 105; *Mut.* 29–32; *Aet.* 41–44). Spicq 1952: 1: 43–44 concludes that the author of Hebrews is indebted to Philo here, but as Williamson 1970: 46–51 points out, Philo uses the words for the creation of the world and the author of Hebrews for the construction of the new Jerusalem. Josephus juxtaposes the two words referring to builders in *Ant.* 12.35, and in *Ant.* 12.23 he uses δημιουργημα of humans as God’s “workmanship.” Wisdom 13:1 uses τεχνίτης of God, and T. Job 39:12, the later Hel. Syn. Pr. (Apos. Con. 8.5.2; 8.12.22; 8.40.2) and the much later Gk. Apoc. Ezra use δημιουργός of God.

temple, but in a restored temple-city (the heavenly Jerusalem), where God was expected to lay the foundations.¹³⁵

Verses 13–16 are an important digression, emphasising the eschatological perspective of the chapter.¹³⁶ Verse 13 explains that Abraham, Sarah and the other Patriarchs died in faith, not having received the “promises” (ἐπαγγελία, pl.), although they saw them from a distance and greeted them,¹³⁷ while acknowledging that they were “strangers and aliens on the earth” (ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Verses 14–15 explain that those who recognise that they are strangers and aliens make it clear that they are seeking a “homeland” (πατρίς). However, this homeland is quite different from normal uses of the word; it is not the place they “left” (ἐκβαίνω)¹³⁸ but the place they

135 Betz 1987: 106; O'Brien 2010: 414. For God laying the foundations of the eschatological Zion/Jerusalem see Ps 87 (LXX 86:5); Isa 28:16; 44:28; 54:11; for the stability of the heavenly city see Ps 46:4–5; and for God laying the foundations of the earthly Zion/Jerusalem see Ps 48:8 (LXX 47:9); 87:1 (LXX 86:2); Isa 14:32; 58:12. In 4 Ezra 10:27 the eschatological Jerusalem is a “place of huge foundations” (*locus . . . de fundamentis magnis*), and in Rev 21:14, 19 the new Jerusalem has foundations, named with the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Of course, tents have no foundations, in contrast to this anticipated city. See De Young 1960: 138; Muntingh 1971: 108–29; Lane 1991b: 351–52; Ellingworth 1993: 584.

136 Swetnam 1981: 91–92; Lane 1991b: 355; O'Brien 2010: 417–18.

137 That Abraham and the Patriarchs saw and “greeted” (ἀσπάζομαι) the promises indicates that they did not just see a mirage or an illusion (Moffatt 1924: 173; Braun 1984: 363). Apart from Matt 10:12, where Jesus advises his disciples to greet any “house” (οἶκος) they enter, clearly referring to those in the house, elsewhere in the NT ἀσπάζομαι only occurs with a personal direct object (including Heb 13:24) suggesting to Bockmuehl 2009: 369–70 that this was like greeting a friend, and to Ellingworth 1993: 594 that the city Abraham and the Patriarchs awaited was primarily a community. Spicq 1952: 1: 84 cites as a supposed parallel Philo *Spec.* 4.17, who uses προσκυνέω (“prostrate oneself”) to refer to the plight of exiled slaves, unable to fall to the surface of their homeland on arrival there. Heb 11:13 is quite different from this.

138 Ἐκβαίνω is a *hapax legomenon* here in the NT and is rare in the LXX, appearing in Josh 4:16, 17, 18 (the priests coming up out of the Jordan with the ark); Isa 24:18; Jdt 5:8 (abandoning the ways of one's ancestors); 1 Macc 4:27; 15:4; Sir 30:8; 38:18. Ellingworth 1993: 597 suggests an allusion to Josh 4, although an allusion to Jdt 5 is more likely, referring to the ancestors who have lived in Mesopotamia and left at the beginning of a potted history of Israel from Abraham to the return from the exile. The second revisers of $\aleph$ and D, as well as Ψ and the Majority Text read ἐξῆλθον, perhaps assimilating to v. 8. The attestation for ἐκβαίνω is strong (P⁴⁶ *vid.*, the original hands of $\aleph$ and D, A, P and several minuscules), and it should be retained.

were “seeking” (ἐπιζητέω), to which they were more attached than their place of origin.¹³⁹

The homeland they sought that was “better” (κρείττων), “because” (τοῦτ’ ἔστιν)¹⁴⁰ it is “heavenly” (ἐπουράνιος), since God has “prepared” (ἐτοιμάζω) a “city” (πόλις) for them. The use of ἐτοιμάζω echoes the text that above all refers to the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people, Exod 15:17—the “sanctuary” (ἁγιάσμα) God’s hands have prepared.¹⁴¹

Abraham is significant in Heb 11 not only by virtue of the length of the treatment given to him, but also because he is “the paradigmatic father of the pilgrim people of God *en route* to the better country and the city built by God.”¹⁴² He contrasts with the wilderness generation of Heb 3:7–4:11, who failed to enter God’s rest through disobedience.¹⁴³ While the city that Abraham seeks is unnamed in Heb 11, its descriptions identify it as the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem of 12:22 and the city to come of 13:14.¹⁴⁴

Hebrews 11 ends with a similar statement. Not only did Abraham and the Patriarchs die in faith, waiting for their inheritance, but all those mentioned in the chapter, while commended for their faith, did not “receive” (κομίζω) “the

139 Πάτρις appears elsewhere in the NT only in Matt 13:54, 57; Mark 6:1, 4; Luke 4:23–24; John 4:44, referring to a prophet’s hometown, where no honour is received. Here the patriarchs were seeking a heavenly homeland—their destination rather than their place of origin (O’Brien 2010: 420). Πάτρις appears twenty-four times in the LXX (Lev 25:10; Esth 2:10, 20; 8:6; Jer 22:10; 26:16 (LXX); Ezek 23:15; Tob 5:11; 2 Macc 4:1; 5:8, 9, 15; 8:21, 33; 13:3, 10, 14, 18; 4 Macc 1:11; 4:1, 5, 20; 17:21; 18:4), always referring to a place of origin and, at times, expressing a longing for that. The word is also frequent in Philo (eighty-nine times) and in Josephus (one hundred and forty-two times). Significant occurrences referring to attachment to one’s homeland in Philo include *Legat.* 277, 285; *Plant.* 146; *Ebr.* 17; *Flacc.* 46; and in Josephus *Ant.* 1.317; 12.304; 20.11; *J.W.* 1.434. See Ellingworth 1993: 595; Koester 2001: 490; DeSilva 2000b: 394–95 for discussions of homeland in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature. Braun 1970: 319–27 finds dependence on Philo here, who envisages heaven as a homeland that people come from and return to (*Her.* 274, see also 82), but these ideas are absent from Hebrews.

140 For this explanatory sense of τοῦτ’ ἔστιν see Matt 27:49; Mark 7:2; Acts 1:19; 19:4; Rom 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7; Phlm 12; Heb 2:14. See BDAG 741, s.v. οὗτος 1, b, ε.

141 See my discussion of this text in Church 2013a: 354–55. See also Gäbel 2006: 469–70; Tzoref 2009: 203 (note 30).

142 Bockmuehl 2009: 364.

143 In Heb 3:8 they fail because they “disobey” (ἀπειθέω); in 11:8, when called Abraham “obeys” (ὕπακούω). Cf. also Mosser 2009a: 393, “[e]very time the author repeats the word πίστει a contrast is drawn with the ἀπιστία of the wilderness generation.”

144 Bruce 1990: 193–94; Baugh 2006: 130; Bockmuehl 2009: 369, 371, 373; Mosser 2009a: 390–91; Johnson 2006: 293–94; Thompson 2008: 235–38 O’Brien 2010: 412–14.

promise” (ἡ ἐπαγγελία). The promise, the inheritance, the heavenly homeland and the city with foundations are all unspecified in Heb 11, although the language used implies the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, to be confirmed in 12:18–29.

You have come to Mount Zion (12:18–24)

Hebrews 12:1–2 concludes the list of faithful people with the example of Jesus, “the pioneer and perfecter of faith” (ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτής Ἰησοῦς).¹⁴⁵ A string of imperatives in vv. 3–17 demonstrate that this pericope is an appeal to the readers to persevere and endure discipline,¹⁴⁶ ending with the negative example of Esau, who fell short of the grace of God (v. 15), sacrificing his inheritance rights to satisfy his immediate hunger. A further imperative appears in v. 25, where the readers are to “see to it” (βλέπω) that they do not refuse the one who speaks.¹⁴⁷ Between the example of Esau (12:14–17) and the call to listen to the one who speaks is a finely balanced pericope that claims that the readers have not come to Sinai but to Zion. This pericope, the “grand finale” of Hebrews,¹⁴⁸ contains significant temple imagery.

145 Richardson 2012: 167–224 demonstrates how Jesus brings the list to its proper climax, and that all those listed in Heb 11 are typological anticipations of him.

146 There are twenty-one second person plural imperatives in Hebrews: three in Heb 3 (vv. 1, 12, 13), one in 7:4, one in 10:32 and sixteen in chapters 12–13 (Heb 12:3, 12, 13, 14, 25; 13:2, 3, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 24). There are also nineteen hortatory subjunctives, but only four fall in Heb 12–13 (see 2:1; 3:6, 14; 4:1, 11, 14, 16; 6:1, 18; 10:22, 23, 24; 12:1, 28; 13:13, 15). Exhortation is mostly replaced by directive in the closing chapters of Hebrews.

147 The present imperative of βλέπω also appears in 3:12 as part of the appeal to the readers to hear the Holy Spirit speaking in Ps 95:7–11.

148 Lindars 1989: 402. Lindars actually refers to 12:18–29 as the “grand finale.” I examine vv. 25–29 later in this chapter. Others who assign climactic significance to 12:18–24 in the rhetorical structure of Hebrews include Lane 1991b: 448; Isaacs 1992: 87; Ellingworth 1993: 669; Guthrie 1994: 143; Koester 2001: 548; Son 2005: 78; Thompson 2008: 266 (who seems to have changed his mind from 1982: 44, where following Käsemann 1939: 27–29 [ET 1984: 48–51] he proposed that vv. 18–24 had been taken over from some other source and adapted); O’Brien 2010: 477; Barnard 2012: 208. Others who see the incorporation of a traditional source here include Rissi 1987: 101–2 and Scholer 1991: 137–38. On the other hand, Jones 1985: 396–74 finds that the theme of the two covenants that has pervaded Hebrews is synthesised in this pericope, and Son 2005: 24, 77–104 (and *passim*) argues that this pericope “reveals the author’s conceptual framework on the basis of which he has developed his argument throughout this epistle” (p. 24) and sums up everything that precedes. Son has probably overstated the results of his study, but there is no doubt that

This pericope does not stand alone, however, being joined to what precedes with the causal particle γάρ, showing that vv. 18–24 provide the theological foundation for the warnings of vv. 14–17.¹⁴⁹ Moreover, the repetition of the present participle of λαλέω (“to speak”) in vv. 24, 25 shows that vv. 18–24 lead into the appeal to listen to the speech of God.

Hebrews 12:18–24 comprises two contrasting sentences, the first beginning with the expression οὐ . . . προσεληλύθατε (“you have not come”), and the second beginning with ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε (“but you have come”). While no mountain is named as the place to which the readers have not come,¹⁵⁰ it is clear from the string of descriptors joined by the conjunction καί that Sinai is in view. The text describes “the physical phenomena accompanying the giving of the law,”¹⁵¹ followed by the reaction of the people who could not endure the order that no animal could touch the mountain, and of Moses who trembled with fear. The overriding emotion that surfaces in this description is terror at the presence of God. As in 3:7–4:11, the readers are compared with the Sinai generation. But, while in the earlier text the comparison was motivation to persevere so as to attain to God’s rest in the heavenly temple, here it is motivation to seek peace and sanctification (12:14), since they already have proleptic access to that heavenly temple.

The perfect indicative of προσέρχομαι (“to approach”) needs to be read similarly in vv. 18 and 22. These are the final occurrences of the verb in Hebrews, and only here is it in the indicative mood. Previously, it has referred to the approach of the community to God, either his throne (4:16) or God himself (7:25; 10:22; 11:6); as well as to the approach of the Israelites to God under the old covenant (10:1).¹⁵² Here, the text claims that the readers have not come to

this pericope occupies a significant place in concluding the argument, making it unlikely that it has been incorporated from some earlier source.

149 Lane 1991b: 459; Ellingworth 1993: 670.

150 The first sentence claims that the readers have not come to what can be touched using the present passive participle of ψηλαφάω (“to touch, handle”). Several witnesses to the text (D, Ψ, several minuscules, the Majority Text and some versions add ὅρει—the dative singular of ὄρος, “to a mountain”). This reading seems to be secondary, probably assimilated to v. 22 where “Mount Zion” (Σιὼν ὄρος) is the place to which they have come. See Lane 1991b: 441 (note x); Metzger 1994: 605. The word ὅρει is absent from P⁴⁶, Ⲙ, A, C, several minuscules and versions.

151 Johnson 2006: 326. See the discussion in Son 2005: 31–35. The marginal notes in NA²⁸ identify allusions to Exod 19:16–19; 20:18; Deut 4:11–12; 5:22; and the words ἔκφοβός εἰμι (“I am terrified,” 12:21) are from Deut 9:19 where Moses describes his terror at Sinai/Horeb.

152 I discuss below (chapter 8) the cultic sense of προσέρχομαι in Hebrews, where only God, God’s throne or the heavenly temple are “approached.” Εἰσέρχομαι (“to enter”) also has a

Sinai, but to Zion. The verb echoes Deut 4:11 where the people “approached” (προσέρχονται) and “stood” (ἵστημι) at the foot of Horeb. The perfect tense intensifies the action of coming,¹⁵³ and indicates that the readers are to recognise that in their worship,¹⁵⁴ they have come to and are now present at Mount Zion.¹⁵⁵

cultic sense in Hebrews, but normally appears in different contexts. It describes entry into God's rest, which I have argued is in the heavenly temple (3:11, 18, 19; 4:1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, although the impetus for the use of the verb in Heb 3–4 is its appearance in Ps 95 (LXX 94):11, quoted in Heb 3:11). It is used for entry into the heavenly holy of holies (6:19, 20; 9:12, 24), or the earthly (9:25), and for the entry of Christ into the world (10:5). On the basis of this word and the clear temple imagery in the pericope, Scholer (ibid.: 149) extrapolates that the readers of Hebrews, as well as those they encounter in the heavenly temple, have attained “a high priestly status with regard to their access to God.” This is not a necessary deduction and, indeed, the word is never used in Hebrews to refer to the approach of the high priest to the holy of holies. Rather, as Thompson 1982: 45 notes, it is always used of the approach of the community in worship or prayer. Since under the new covenant the former cultic arrangements are no longer necessary, there is no role for the former priesthood. While the faithful now experience the same privileges granted to the former high priests in terms of access to God, they are not thereby given the status of high priests, of which there is now only one (Jesus). Under the new covenant, they have privileges that far outstrip those of the community of the old covenant. The presence of God is open to them, and they worship in the heavenly temple along with the angels, the whole community of the faithful and the righteous dead (Ellingworth 1993: 678).

153 Burton 1976: 38; Campbell 2007: 162, 201–10; 2011: 139–55; O'Brien 2010: 479; Evans 2004: 205–6. In Heb 12:18, 22 the perfect tense expresses the notion that the people have come and are present at Zion, as do the two aorist verbs in Deut 4:11 (προσῆλθετε καὶ ἕστητε, “you came and stood”). A verbal action in any tense has consequences or creates a new state (Campbell 2007: 164–65) and since, as Deut 4:11 indicates, the state of having been at Horeb can be expressed by a simple aorist (you came to Horeb—you should therefore live differently). Here, in Heb 12:18–24, the perfect gives prominence to the new state created by the verbal action (you have come to Zion—therefore you must not refuse the one who speaks, 12:25). In Deut 4:11 the people were no longer at Horeb; here there is no indication that they had left Zion.

154 Jones 1985: 396–97; Scholer 1991: 144; Ellingworth 1993: 678. Scholer (p. 144) refers to “worship and prayer... as the means by which Christians may already dwell in the heavenly... while still on earth.” The text is a reminder to the readers of the access to God that they have in the present (4:14–16; 6:19–20; 7:19; 10:19–23), arising out of their conversion and realised in their worship (Arowele 1990: 444). Barrett 1954: 376; Peterson 1982: 160; Bruce 1990: 255; Thompson 2008: 267; O'Brien 2010: 482 consider that the text is a reference to the conversion of the recipients, cf. the etymology of the English word “proselyte” with the form in this verse (προσεληλύθατε). Barnard 2012: 209 finds this unlikely, since they are encouraged “to repeat this experience (e.g. 4:16; 10:22).”

155 Johnsson 1973: 332 (note 207); Peterson 1982: 160; Casey 1982: 332; Scholer 1991: 143; Attridge 1989: 372; Lane 1991b: 440–41 (note w). Montefiore 1964: 229 suggests that “they

Setting the stage for the contrast in the two sentences (18–21, 22–24) is the clause οὐ . . . προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ (“you have not come to something that can be touched”), which finds its counterpart in the clause ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιών ὄρει (“but you have come to Mount Zion”). This contrast has been read in different ways. Thompson detects a Platonic background and suggests that the word ψηλαφάω (“to touch”) is used pejoratively to distinguish the inferior phenomenal world from the superior noumenal world.¹⁵⁶ However, as elsewhere in Hebrews, the two sentences contrast not what is vertical and spatial, but what is horizontal and eschatological, between two covenants. The former was mediated by Moses (implied, but not stated in the first sentence) and the new covenant is mediated by Jesus (8:6; 9:15; 12:24).¹⁵⁷

Some scholars suggest that Mount Zion cannot be touched primarily because it is future;¹⁵⁸ however, the text nowhere suggests that Mount Zion cannot be touched. That is not the essence of the contrast. The source of the imagery is the palpable darkness of the ninth plague (Exod 10:21),¹⁵⁹ where

have drawn close but not yet arrived”; Hofius 1970b: 142 suggests that they have arrived at the gates; Wilson 1987: 230 suggests that they have come near, but not actually arrived; and Rissi 1987: 100–101 suggests that while they have access to Mount Zion, they remain on earth with their temptations and suffering. Ellingworth 1993: 671 proposes that προσέρχονται is ambiguous here, indicating that “their worship . . . [is] dominated by the reality of heaven . . . yet negative and positive exhortation . . . are still needed.” Thus, the word expresses the already and not yet of Christian eschatology. For similar ideas see Eph 1:3–14. See Lincoln 1990: 19–44.

156 Thompson 1982: 45–47; 2008: 267; Scholer 1991: 140; Ellingworth 1993: 672; Johnson 2006: 329–30. Philo never uses ψηλαφάω in this sense. The verb appears in *Her.* 250 with the sense of groping around in the darkness; and in *Mut.* 126 with the sense of “being in touch with divine things.” In *Mut.* 126 the cognate noun ψηλάφημα (“touch”) also appears as one of the meanings of the name Moses, and in *Leg.* 3. 231 it is the meaning of the name “Chemosh” (Χαμώς). Another associated noun ψηλαφητός (“palpable”) refers to deep darkness in *Somn.* 1.114, an allusion to the same word in Exod 10:21. Thompson 1982: 45 refers to Philo, *Cher.* 57, 73, *Post.* 20, *Legat.* 6, where Philo discusses the distinction between what is and what is not sense-perceptible. In *Cher.* 57 Philo uses the substantive ἀφή (“sense of touch”); in *Cher.* 73 he uses the verb ἅπτω (“to touch”); in *Post.* 20 the verb ψάύω (“to touch”); and in *Legat.* 6 he uses the adjective ἄψαυστος (“untouchable”). Thompson also refers to Plato *Phaedo* 99E (where the verb is ἅπτω, “to touch”); *Tim.* 28B, 31B (adjective ἅπτός, “tangible”). The only occurrence of ψηλαφάω in Plato is in *Phaedro* 99B, where it has the sense “groping . . . as in darkness” (ψηλαφῶντες οἱ πολλοὶ ὥσπερ ἐν σκότει).

157 Fohrer and Lohse 1971:337; Peterson 1982: 160–66; Scholer 1991: 138 (note 1); Lane 1991b: 461.

158 Hurst 1984: 70; Lane 1991b: 461.

159 Attridge 1989: 372; Bruce 1990: 352.

both the adjective ψηλαφητός (“palpable”) appears alongside the noun γνόφος (“darkness”), two words that appear in Heb 12:18. This is a more likely allusion, especially given the semantic range of ψηλαφάω, which includes the sense of “feel around, grope.”¹⁶⁰ The old covenant is characterised by darkness and gloom that is so thick that it can be felt.¹⁶¹ The new covenant communicates “exultation, warmth openness, acceptance, and relationship, set off in bold relief against the dismal portrait of the Sinai assembly.”¹⁶²

Apart from the reference to a “festal gathering” (πανήγυρις) in v. 22, the positive emotions in Heb 12:22–24 are not explicated. Again, the conjunction καί appears seven times, with the eight descriptors falling into four pairs.¹⁶³ “Mount Zion” (Σιών ὄρει) is the destination, with the first descriptor identifying Zion as the “city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem” (πόλει θεοῦ ζώντος, Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ).¹⁶⁴ In the OT, Zion is frequently designated as God’s dwelling place.¹⁶⁵ Given that this is the only reference to Zion in Hebrews, the readers may have inferred that the author was referring to the earthly Zion, the Temple Mount over against Sinai. However, the two additional epithets clarify that the earthly Zion is not in view.¹⁶⁶ The “city” (πόλις) recalls the city with foundations (11:10), that God had prepared for Abraham and the

160 BDAG 1097–98. It appears with this sense in Gen 27:12, 21, 22 where the blind Isaac “touches” Jacob and identifies him as Esau. It also has this sense in Deut 28:29; Judg 16:26; Job 5:14; 12:26; Isa 59:10; Luke 24:39; Acts 17:27.

161 The word translated “touch” in Heb 12:20 is θιγγάνω, in an allusion to Exod 19:12 (where it is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX), also appearing in Heb 11:28 for the destroying angel touching the firstborn of Israel at the Passover; and in the list of regulations in Col 2:21—do not “touch” (ἅπτω), “taste” (νεύομαι) or “handle” (θιγγάνω).

162 Guthrie 1998: 420. Son 2005: 93 proposes that the imagery in these two sentences is neither primarily vertical nor primarily horizontal, rather it explains “the superior situation of the Christian community under the new covenant . . .”

163 Westcott 1892: 412; Attridge 1989: 374; Son 2005: 87–89.

164 All of these expressions are anarthrous in Greek. I have supplied a definite article in English where appropriate. Johnson 2006: 327 translates “a city of the living God, a heavenly Jerusalem,” as though there were more than one of each. He also translates the καί in the expression καί πόλει θεοῦ ζώντος, Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ with “and,” reading “Mount Zion, and a city . . .” But surely this καί is explicative, identifying Zion with the city and Jerusalem (Spicq 1952: 2: 405; Lane 1991b: 441 [note gg]; Ellingworth 1993: 677; O’Brien 2010: 483). This καί is omitted by the original hand of D, but since its omission has such little support it should be retained.

165 1 Kings 14:21; Ps 2:6; 9:11; 48:1; 50:2; 65:1; 74:2; 76:2; 78:68; 84:7; 87:2; 99:2; 102:16, 21; 110:2; 128:5; 132:13; 134:3; 135:21; Amos 1:2; Mic 4:7; Joel 4:16, 17, 21; Zech 2:10; 8:3; 9:9; Isa 8:18; 12:6; 18:7; 24:23; 60:14; 64:10; Sir 36:18.

166 Koester 2001: 550; Son 2005: 89; O’Brien 2010: 483.

patriarchs (11:16),¹⁶⁷ that is, the heavenly Jerusalem.¹⁶⁸ Thus, the author has taken the well-known imagery of Zion/Jerusalem as the place of access to God and, by means of the adjective “heavenly” (ἐπουράνιος), applied it as a metaphor for access to God under the new covenant.¹⁶⁹

As elsewhere in Hebrews, the adjective “heavenly” (ἐπουράνιος) refers to what is to come, now come into the present,¹⁷⁰ the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.¹⁷¹ Thus, temple imagery is pressed into service to symbolise the relationship between God and his people under the new covenant. This is appropriate, since Zion/Jerusalem is a cipher for the temple where God was encountered. The figurative language used elsewhere for this dwelling: “the world to come” (2:5); “God’s rest” (4:1–11); “the true tent” (8:2); “within the curtain” (6:19–20; 10:19–25); “the city built by God” (11:10); “the heavenly homeland” (11:16); “the unshakeable kingdom” (12:28); and “the city to come” (13:14), is now extended to include the heavenly Jerusalem.

The next pair of descriptors refers to the inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem, the “myriads of angels in a festal gathering” (μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει),¹⁷² and the “assembly of the firstborn, inscribed in heaven” (ἐκκλησίᾳ

167 Johnson 2006: 331; Fuller Dow 2010: 173–74.

168 Attridge 1989: 374. Buchanan 1972: 222 thinks it is a reference to the restored earthly city of Jerusalem, called “heavenly” because of its divine origin. He refers to Ezek 40–48; Zech 14:9–11. But this is to misread the eschatological outlook of Hebrews. See Gordon 2008: 43–44.

169 DeSilva 2000b: 466.

170 Heb 3:1; 6:4; 8:5; 9:23; 11:16.

171 Lane 1991b: 465; Koester 2001: 544; Son 2005: 91; O’Brien 2010: 483. The notion of a (new) heavenly Jerusalem is absent from the OT, but appears in Rabbinic and apocalyptic literature as the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people. See T. Dan 5:12–13; 2 Bar. 4:2–7; 4 Ezra 7:26; 8:52; 10:27, 54; 13:36; 1 En. 90:26–39; 2 En. 55:2; Tob 13:10–16; Sib. Or. 3:787; 5:250–251; Gal 4:26; Rev 3:12; 21:1–4; b. Hag. 12b; B. Bat. 75b. See Barrett 1954: 374–76. Philo (*Somn.* 2. 250) refers to Jerusalem not made of wood or stone, but found in a peaceful human soul. Thus, in Philo, Jerusalem is allegorised as a “vision of peace” (Williamson 1970: 144; Fuglseth 2005: 215). In Hebrews, there is no such allegory; rather the heavenly Jerusalem is a metaphor for the dwelling of God with his people.

172 The original hand of D reads μυρίων ἁγίων ἀγγέλων (a myriad of holy angels). This reading is only attested in this MS and, for this reason, as well as the genitive case of μυρίων among a succession of datives, indicates that it is secondary. It is debated whether the dative singular of πανηγύρις refers to what precedes (the angels) or to what follows (the assembly of the firstborn). The presence of καί after πανηγύρει suggests that is to be construed with what precedes, as a circumstantial dative qualifying the angels. If it is construed with what follows the καί functions as in v. 22, expressing the idea that the readers have come to a festal gathering, “even” (καί) the assembly of the firstborn. Apart from v. 22 καί

πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς).¹⁷³ The presence of angels in a festal gathering is to be read in the context of the numerous references to angels in the other literature surveyed in earlier chapters of this study. Especially at Qumran, the community seems to have envisaged that they were involved with angelic worship, either on earth in the life of the community, or in the heavenly temple.¹⁷⁴ As well as the notion that the Qumran community were involved with angelic worship, angels also feature in other texts as cultic officials in the heavenly temple.¹⁷⁵ All these texts include the notion of a heavenly journey, something that is absent from Hebrews. Here, the community is pictured as already having come to the heavenly Jerusalem and participating in angelic worship, while still earthbound. The heavenly Jerusalem encompasses earth and heaven and is where the new covenant community encounters God and his heavenly entourage in worship.

functions elsewhere in this list to join different aspects of Mount Zion, making this latter option unlikely, although adopted by De Young 1960: 139 (note 69), and reflected in the punctuation of NA²⁸. For arguments for construing it with what precedes see Williamson 1970: 68; Hughes 1977: 552–54 (who gives six possible options); Attridge 1989: 375; Bruce 1990: 353; Lane 1991b: 441–42 (note jj); Scholer 1991: 145 (note 5); Ellingworth 1993: 679; O'Brien 2010: 484 (note 209).

- 173 The Majority Text and one minuscule witness invert the word order here. The evidence for the word order in the main text of NA²⁸ is much stronger.
- 174 In my treatment of the Sabbath Songs (chapter 3, above) I discussed the understanding that these songs envisaged angelic worship in the heavenly temple, and also the notion that the community considered that they were worshipping God alongside the angels while earthbound in the Judean desert. See also my treatment in chapter 3 of *The Community Rule; The Rule of the Congregation; The War Scroll; 4QInstruction; Hodayot; 4QBerakhot; 4QDaily Prayers*. For these connections with Qumran see Strugnell 1960: 320; Gärtner 1965: 89–99; Bruce 1990: 357–58; Lane 1991b: 468. Some of the early literature on Qumran (especially Gärtner 1965: 94–99 on the relationship between 1QM and Heb 12) overstates the case for connections between Qumran and this text in Hebrews, as the differences are significant. The reference in Hebrews to Mount Zion is absent from Qumran, and the Qumran understanding of the community as a temple is, at best, muted if present at all in Hebrews. Furthermore, the elaborate descriptions of the heavenly temple and liturgy at Qumran are absent from Hebrews. See the judicious comments in Klinzing 1971: 201–2, who suggests the adoption of a common tradition with significant differences in the way it has been put to use.
- 175 Jub. 31:14; T. Levi 3:5; 1 En. 5–16; Apoc. Zeph. Already in the OT numerous angels inhabit heaven and are involved in the worship of God (Ps 89:6; 103:21; 148:2), a tradition also reflected in Rev 5:11–12.

Some scholars read the “assembly of the firstborn inscribed in heaven” as a further reference to angels,¹⁷⁶ but the notion of enrolment in heaven seems to indicate humans are in view. They are the firstborn ones, who belong to Jesus the firstborn one, already in the world to come (1:6). This is the “assembly” (ἐκκλησία) of Heb 2:12 that he came to sanctify, the siblings of Jesus, enrolled in heaven, now assembling in the heavenly temple,¹⁷⁷ and participating in the “Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) of Heb 4:9.¹⁷⁸

The temple imagery fades with the next pair of descriptors. “God the judge of all” (κριτὴ θεῶ πάντων) is present, as are the “spirits of the righteous made perfect” (πνεύμασι¹⁷⁹ δικαίων τετελειωμένων). In 10:26–31 those who persist in sin have only the fearful prospect of judgment. But the reference to God as judge, juxtaposed in this verse with the reference to the spirits of the righteous made perfect, that is, the righteous dead,¹⁸⁰ indicates that there is also the prospect of positive judgment for those made perfect—dead Christians already worshipping in heaven.¹⁸¹ These include those listed in Heb 11 (see Heb 11:40) and all who endure to the end. For these people there is the prospect of eschatological acceptance.¹⁸² Thus, the worship of the community on earth, wherever it is located, is also in the heavenly temple in the presence of myriads of angels, the assembly of the firstborn and the righteous dead.

The final pair of descriptors refers to the “mediator of the new covenant, Jesus” (διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ), and “the blood of sprinkling, speaking in a better manner¹⁸³ than [the blood of] Abel” (αἷματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρείττον λαλοῦντι

176 Spicq 1952: 2: 407–8; Montefiore 1964: 231; Käsemann 1984: 50 (note 89).

177 Peterson 1982: 162; Bruce 1990: 358; Attridge 1989: 375; Lane 1991b: 468–69; Ellingworth 1993: 679; Johnson 2006: 332.

178 Lane 1991b: 467; Koester 2001: 545.

179 The original hand of D, B, and some Vulgate MSS read πνεύματι (singular, “by [S]pirit”). Attridge 1989: 371, probably rightly, suggests a “Trinitarian connection.” In place of δικαίων τετελειωμένων the original hand of D and Hilary read δικαίων τεθεμελιωμένων (“of the righteous who have been established”), and the original hand of **Σ** reads πνεύμασι τελείων δεδικαιωμένοις (“justified spirits of perfect ones”). The evidence for these readings is slim, and the reading adopted in NA²⁸ well suits the context of Hebrews.

180 Arowele 1990: 444–45. See 1 En. 22:3–4; 41:8; 103:3–4.

181 Scholer 1991: 146.

182 O’Brien 2010: 487.

183 Κρείττον (“better”) is probably best construed as an adverb (Attridge 1989: 377) rather than a singular adjective where it would refer to “something better.” P⁴⁶ and 1505 read κρείττονα (plural, “better things”), but this attestation is minimal.

παρὰ τὸν Ἀβελ).¹⁸⁴ That Jesus is there indicates a reference to the heavenly temple. The blood of sprinkling echoes Heb 9:11–22 and the inauguration of both the Sinai covenant and the new covenant, the latter enabling the promised eternal inheritance (9:22) envisaged in the present text.

The reference to the mediator of the new covenant locates the source of the Zion imagery of Heb 12:22–24 in Jeremiah's new covenant prophecy already quoted and discussed in Heb 8–10. In Jer 31:6, the returning exiles call upon one another to come up to Zion, in v. 13 they come and rejoice on Mount Zion, and in v. 38 the city is rebuilt. The return to Zion there "symbolizes the eschatological return of the world to YHWH to establish the new covenant."¹⁸⁵ Thus the author has taken the language of the return from exile and the inauguration of the new covenant with the concomitant restoration of Jerusalem and the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion, and transferred it from the earthly Jerusalem to the heavenly. Christian worship is directed elsewhere than towards the earthly Jerusalem and the temple, and the presence of the living God is no longer there, but in the heavenly Jerusalem.

This neatly balanced pericope contrasts the terrifying events surrounding the inauguration of the Sinai covenant with "the ultimate, eschatological encounter with God in the heavenly Jerusalem."¹⁸⁶ Considerable temple imagery surfaces in the description, indicating that under the new covenant the encounter with God is the reality to which the Jerusalem temple pointed. Given the emphasis in Hebrews on the need to persevere, it seems clear that

184 The question as to whether the blood of Abel speaks in this verse (as in Gen 4:10) or whether Abel speaks (as in Heb 11:4) is not critical to this study. Ellingworth and Nida 1983: 313 and O'Brien 2010: 489 claim that most translations add a reference to the blood of Abel speaking (alongside the sprinkled blood of Jesus), and this reading is explicit in P⁴⁶ followed by L and a few minuscules where the definite article appears as neuter (τό, governing the neuter αἷμα blood), rather than τὸν (masculine, governing Ἀβελ), read by ⱼ, A, C and numerous minuscules. One late minuscule (1962) reads the genitive definite article. The definite article appears with a personal name in Hebrews only here and in 7:1 (where it is required by the grammatical structure, οὗτος . . . ὁ Μελχισέδεκ, "now this Melchizedek"); 6:13 (where it clarifies that Abraham is in the dative case); and in 11:20 (where it clarifies that Isaac and Jacob are in the accusative case). Lane 1991b: 442 (note qq) suggests these statistics make the reading with the masculine definite article unlikely. Smillie 2004: 275–83 argues from Heb 12:25 that God is speaking in v. 24, but this requires a disturbance in the tight rhetorical structure of 12:18–24 at its climactic point. See the discussion (and the critique of Smillie's position) in O'Brien 2010: 489–91.

185 Son 2005: 49. See also Fohrer and Lohse 1971: 316–17 who discuss the eschatological implications of the return to Zion in such texts as Isa 2:2–4//Mic 4:1–3; Jer 3:17; Zech 8:22.

186 O'Brien 2010: 491.

this imagery does not nullify the eschatological goal that lies ahead of the readers. Rather, it clarifies that in their worship they can now, proleptically,¹⁸⁷ experience what is promised to them at the end of their journey to God's rest, a "*pre-death experience of the divine*."¹⁸⁸ There, they will find a reality that had been experienced all along.¹⁸⁹ Here the faithful have access to the presence of God,¹⁹⁰ that will be consummated in the future when they attain to God's rest (4:11), as long as they endure and remain faithful.

A Kingdom that cannot be Shaken (12:25–29)

There are several verbal and rhetorical links between this passage and the first warning in 2:1–4, forming an inclusio around Heb 2–12.¹⁹¹ The readers are now warned not to "disregard" (παραιτέομαι)¹⁹² the one who speaks. It takes the form of a *qal wahomer* argument: since those who disregarded the one who warned them on earth did not escape, it is even more important for them not to turn away from the one who warns from heaven. The parallels between this text and 2:1–4, as well as the reference to Sinai in 12:18–21, indicate that the one speaking in 12:25 is God.¹⁹³ At Sinai he warned "on earth" (ἐπὶ γῆς, 12:25),¹⁹⁴

187 Johnson 2006: 328. See the discussion in Lane 1991b: 465, who writes, "[t]hrough faith that grasps the future as though it were present . . . Christians come to that future reality."

188 Barnard 2012: 210.

189 Jewett 1981: 223; Scholer 1991: 144.

190 Scholer 1991: 145.

191 On the similarities between Heb 2:1–4; 12:25–29 see Auffret 1979: 178–79; Lane 1991b: 477; DeSilva 2000b: 470; Smillie 2004: 286–87. Both warnings take the form of a *qal wahomer* argument concerning God's speech (using the word λαλέω), both contain the word ἐκφεύγω ("to escape"), referring to those who either neglect to act on God's speech, or deliberately reject it, and both contain allusions to the Sinai events.

192 For the translation "disregard" see Lane 1991b: 475. Παραιτέομαι occurs three times in Hebrews. In 12:19 it is followed by a (negated) infinitive and has the sense of "to beg." It appears twice in 12:25, followed by participles referring to God's speech to the readers and his warning to them from heaven. Here, it "connotes a deliberate and culpable refusal to listen to the one speaking" (Lane, *ibid.*: 475). On this verb see BDAG 764, and Lane *ibid.*: 462–63.

193 Ellingworth 1993: 683–84; Smillie 2004: 283–87.

194 The word order reflected in NA²⁸ (ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα) is supported by the corrector of P⁴⁶, the original hand of B, A, C, D, I, numerous minuscules and the Coptic versions. This word order, with "on earth" placed at the start for emphasis and "the one who warned" in the secondary emphatic position at the end, could cause confusion as to whether the "on earth" related to the one warning or to the ones who disregarded

now he warns “from heaven” (ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν).¹⁹⁵ “Then” (τότε) his voice “shook” (σαλεύω) the earth,¹⁹⁶ “now” (νῦν) he promises that he will “once more shake not only the earth, but also heaven” (ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν),¹⁹⁷ words taken from Hag 2:6 and modified to make a significant point.

Haggai 1:15b–2:9 compares the temple being restored in the sixth century BCE with its former glory (Solomon’s temple) and suggests that it is as though it was as nothing in their eyes (Hag 2:3); that is, nothing about it suggested that God would be honoured by it.¹⁹⁸ Nevertheless, God announced that “in a little while he would shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land” (Ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν). He would cause all the nations to “tremble” (συσσείσω), the “treasure” (הַמַּדָּה, LXX ἐκλεκτός)¹⁹⁹ of all the nations would come and God would fill the house

the warning. For this reason, other MS traditions change the word order. The original hand of P⁴⁶, the second corrector of $\aleph$, Ψ , 0285 and the Majority Text read τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα παραιτησάμενοι (which BDF 250, 51, § 474, 5c and Ellingworth 1993: 685 note is the “normal” word order), and MSS 104, 629, a few others and (the supposed *Vorlage* of) the Vulgate read τὸν παραιτησάμενοι ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα. As Lane 1991b: 442–43 notes these modifications make it more explicit “that ἐπὶ γῆς modifies the one who warns, not those who failed to escape.”

- 195 Several minuscules have “heaven” in the singular here.
- 196 While the reference is apparently to the earthquake accompanying the eruption at Sinai (Exod 19:18), the LXX of Exod 19:18 differs from the MT, with the people trembling rather than the earth. The allusion is probably to Judg 5:4–5 where the mountains “shook” (σαλεύω) and the earth “trembled” (σεῖω).
- 197 That God shakes earth and heaven, sea and dry land also appears in Hag 2:21, where the verb σείω is in the present tense. MSS D, Ψ , and the Majority Text read the present tense of σείω here in Hebrews, perhaps assimilating to Hag 2:21. There is overwhelming support for the future (P⁴⁶, $\aleph$, A, C, numerous minuscules, as well as some versions).
- 198 There is no sense in Haggai that this is a “second temple.” The text is explicit: the people are asked about “this house in its former glory” (הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה בְּכְבוֹדוֹ הָרִאשׁוֹן). Meadowcroft 2006: 151–53 also notes that “glory” (כְּבוֹד) concerns not the grandeur of the buildings (which were still incomplete), but the extent to which the temple under construction honoured YHWH, as in 1:8. The Targum of Hag 1:8 renders the Hebrew verb כָּבַד (“to honour”) with שִׁכְנִיָּה, referring to the glory associated with the presence of the deity.
- 199 For this sense of ἐκλεκτός see BDAG 306, s.v. ἐκλεκτός, 3. The MT points the Hebrew word as הַמַּדָּה (singular), but the verb is plural, leading to the proposal in BHS to change the pointing to הַמַּדָּה (plural, see GKC 463, §145, e; Wolff 1988: 70). LXX renders it with the plural τὰ ἐκλεκτά. The reference to silver and gold in v. 8 indicates that the nations would contribute to the building project (Smith 1984: 413). However, the Targum reads the text with a much bigger project in view, with the nations streaming to the temple with their treasures (וַיָּבִיאוּ כָּל עֲמֻמֵּיָא, “and they will bring the treasures of all the

with “glory,” (כבוד, LXX δόξα), and “the later glory” (ἡ δόξα . . . ἡ ἐσχάτη) of “this house” (ὁ οἶκος οὗτος) would be greater than the “former” (πρώτος) glory (2:6–9).

This context in Haggai is determinative for the understanding of Heb 12:26–28.²⁰⁰ While the imagery of shaking in Haggai’s prophetic predecessors heralded cosmic disturbance related to God’s judgement against Israel and/or the nations,²⁰¹ in Haggai it announces the gathering of the nations into Israel.²⁰² The traditions of holy war are put to use in a new way as YHWH shakes heaven and earth, sea and dry land to bring in the new order.²⁰³

In incorporating Hag 2:6 into his discourse, the author omits the reference to the sea and the dry land, inverts the references to heaven and earth, and transforms the list in Haggai to a contrast with the addition of οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ (“not only . . . but also”). The expression οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν (“not only earth but also heaven”) refers the reader back to the shaking of the earth at Sinai (Heb 12:26) and announces an eschatological shaking of both earth and heaven. Hebrews 12:27 interprets the Haggai quotation. However, heaven and earth fade into the background and only the words ἔτι ἅπαξ (“once more”) receive any comment. The ἔτι ἅπαξ indicates the “removal” (μετάθεσις)²⁰⁴ of “the things that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is, “things that have been made” (πεποιήμενα) so that “the things that cannot be shaken” (τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα) can “remain” (μένω). The pericope concludes with an appeal to

peoples”). See the translation in Cathcart and Gordon 1989: 179, and note 4 on that page), and Meadowcroft 2006: 169. The involvement of nations with the eschatological temple is reflected in Isa 2:2–4; 60:1–22; Mic 4:1–4; Zech 14:16; Rev 21:26; Sib. Or. 3.657–808.

200 Laansma 2008b: 13.

201 See Isa 13:13; 24:18; Jer 4:24; 8:16; 10:10; 49:21; 50:46; Ezek 26:10, 15; 31:16; 38:20; Joel 2:10; 4:16; Nah 1:5. See also Ps 18:8 (LXX).

202 Smith 1984: 157–58; Wolff 1988: 81; Meadowcroft 2006: 164–65.

203 Wolff 1988: 81. Hag 2:6–9 was also read in this way by authors roughly contemporary with Hebrews (2 Bar. 59:3–12; 4 Ezra 6:11–16, 25–28: 10:25–28).

204 In the NT μετάθεσις only appears in Heb 7:12; 11:5; 12:27. In 7:12 a “change” (μετατίθημι) in the priesthood necessitates a “change” (μετάθεσις) in the law; 11:5 refers to the “removal” (μετάθεσις) of Enoch (see Gen 5:24; Sir 44:16 where μετατίθημι also appears); and the sense of Hag 2:1–9; 22 indicates that this is probably the sense here. See Hurst 1984: 71; Lane 1991b: 443, 481; Mackie 2007: 66–67; Adams 2007: 190; BDAG 639, 642. In the LXX μετατίθημι appears to have the sense “to remove” in Gen 5:24; Deut 27:17; 3 Macc 1:16; Wis 4:10; Sir 44:16; Hos 5:10, and “to change” or “transform” in 3 Kgdms 21:25; 2 Macc 4:46; 7:24; 4 Macc 2:18; Ps 45:3; Sir 6:9; Isa 29:14, 17. Nevertheless, at times the sense seems to glide between the two and it is difficult to gauge where the usage fits on a spectrum from one to another. The word appears in Philo with the sense of “change” (*Gig.* 66; *Mut.* 60, 130; *Abr.* 18, 81; *Ios.* 136; *Praem.* 17; *Act.* 113).

the readers to give thanks because they are receiving “a kingdom that cannot be shaken” (βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος), since their God is a consuming fire.²⁰⁵

Thompson recognises the background in Hag 2:6, but suggests that this text betrays “the author’s dualistic worldview.” He argues that the “eternally abiding realm” (βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος) is set over against “the realm that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is “the created things” (τὰ πεποιήμενα). These, he claims are “merely made” and “transitory” over against what is “not material.”²⁰⁶ Thompson detaches this text from the world of Jewish apocalyptic that knows nothing of what he describes as “two worlds already possessing full reality, one of which is material, and therefore shakeable; the other is not material, and is unshakable.”²⁰⁷ He then argues for the removal of the space-time, sense-perceptible universe so that the noumenal world can remain. What is created and phenomenal is inferior to what is uncreated and noumenal. The former will be removed, and the latter will remain.

There is no need, however, to read Haggai through the eyes of Philo.²⁰⁸ Careful attention to the context in Haggai, and to the way the author has treated the LXX text of Haggai, shows that metaphysical concerns are not in view here. Haggai anticipated the eschatological temple, the new order of things when God would fill his house with splendour. In Hebrews this new order is the city

205 The picture of God as a consuming fire appears in Exod 24:17 in connection with the Sinai theophany; in Deut 4:24 in a warning against idolatry; and in Deut 9:3 in a reference to the destruction of the inhabitants of Canaan. πῦρ καταναλίσκω describes God in Deut 4:24; 9:3, and the probable source of the imagery is Deut 4:24, given the appeal for acceptable worship.

206 Lane 1991b: 443 suggests that Thompson “slants the interpretation of the text” with the addition of the adverb “merely.” There is no warrant for this addition and no suggestion in Hebrews that created things are inferior as this adverb suggests.

207 See Thompson 1982: 48–52; 2008: 268–69 for the entire argument. Similar views are found in Cody 1960: 140–44; Käsemann 1984: 51–52; Attridge 1989: 381; Ellingworth 1993: 688; Johnson 2006: 335–36; Schenck 2007: 125–32. Not only do these ideas result from the imposition of Platonic thought categories onto Hebrews, they also contradict the positive assessment of created things elsewhere in Hebrews. Adams 2009: 129 suggests, “[t]he inherent goodness of the existing created order . . . which would have been axiomatic for this author, is not in these verses [9:11; 12:27] called into question.” For a positive assessment of the created order in Hebrews see also Laansma 2008a: 125–43.

208 Hurst 1984: 69–73; Mackie 2007: 67–71. Lincoln 2006: 98 suggests that a Platonic reading of Heb 12:25–29 “does not do enough justice to the axiom that words take on a particular force from their most immediate context, so that the vocabulary here should primarily be interpreted within the major assumptions that are clearly operative in Hebrews.”

to come (13:14), Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem and the city of the living God (12:22).²⁰⁹

The identification of “the things that have been made” (τὰ πεποιημένα) that will be removed is significant. I have already critiqued Thompson’s view that this refers to the created universe as “merely made,” with the pejorative implications of that expression. Others also identify the things that have been made as the created universe,²¹⁰ although not always with Thompson’s pejorative connotations. But Laansma denies categorically that the removal of the creation is in view at all in this text, referring instead to the cleansing of creation. The things associated with the former cult that oppose God will be removed,²¹¹ that is, the Jerusalem temple and its associated cult.²¹²

That this is correct is seen from an analysis of the syntax of vv. 26–27. What God will “shake” (σειώ) is earth and heaven, what will be “removed” (μετάθεις, μετατίθημι) are “the things that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is, “the things that are made” (τὰ πεποιήμενα). The switch from σειώ to σαλεύω in the light of v. 26, where God’s voice shook the earth at Sinai, is significant for two reasons. First, it distinguishes between the things that can be shaken; that is,

209 Hebrews 12:25–29 does not refer explicitly to a new heaven and earth, but these texts along with the background of the Haggai text, which refers to the shaking of the present order so that the new order can be introduced, imply that a new heaven and earth are expected, see Lincoln 2006: 96–97; Adams 2009: 137–38.

210 E.g. DeSilva 2000b: 472–73; Mitchell 2007: 290; Adams 2007: 190–91; Allen 2010: 596.

211 Laansma 2008b: 14. In Hebrews the things qualified with the verb ποιέω (“made”) include “the ages” (οἱ αἰῶνες) to be sure (1:2), but they also include the old covenant (8:9, soon to disappear, 8:13) and the wilderness tabernacle (8:5) and by extension the temple. In 9:11 the “greater and more perfect tent,” that is the new means of access to God is “not made by human hands” (οὐ χειροποίητος), as also the heavenly sanctuary (9:24). While Adams 2007: 191 lists “the things that remain” in Hebrews as part of his argument for the dissolution of heaven and earth, he does not appear to have considered the things that are “made,” nor does he note the city of 13:14 that does not “remain” (οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ᾧδε μένουσαν πόλιν), on this see 7.8 (below).

212 Hurst 1984: 70–71; Walker 1994: 64; 1996: 232; Laansma 2008b: 12–14 identify the Jerusalem temple as what will be removed in this verse. See also Heb 8:13; 10:25, 37 all of which can be read in the light of the anticipated conflagration in Jerusalem (Walker 1994: 64–65). The reading of πεποιημένων in 12:27 as a reference to “created things” needs to be challenged. The readers are part of the created order (see Koester 2001: 548), but it seems clear that these will not be removed; the world to come will be subject to these (Heb 2:5–9). On the other hand vv. 25–27 imply that those who refuse the God who speaks will be removed/destroyed (ibid.: 552).

the things connected with Sinai that will be removed,²¹³ and the cosmic disturbance connected with the quotation from Haggai. Given the temple connotations of Sinai and given that in 12:18–21 Sinai signifies the old order, the things that will be removed are the things connected with the former order, so that the things connected with the new order, the heavenly things can remain.²¹⁴

The second reason for the change in the verb from *σεῖω* to *σαλεύω* is connected with its connotations in other significant LXX texts. In my earlier discussion of the subjection of the world to come to humanity (Heb 2:5),²¹⁵ I referred to Vanhoye's suggestion that the background of this idea is to be found in Pss 93 and 96, ἡ οἰκουμένη ("the inhabited world") refers to the eschatological world where God comes to reign.²¹⁶ These Psalms describe this eschatological world as unshakeable (*σαλεύω*, negated as in Heb 12:27–28).²¹⁷ Thus, Vanhoye draws a connection between the eschatological subjection of the world to come in Heb 2:5 and the unshakeable kingdom of these verses.

While ἀσάλευτος only appears three times in the LXX with an entirely different sense,²¹⁸ *σαλεύω* is more frequent, appearing seventy-eight times.²¹⁹ Not all are relevant to the present context, but in four texts *σαλεύω* is negated and refers to the establishment of the unshakeable world where God reigns, and in Ps 93 (LXX 92):1; 96 (LXX 95):10 the unshakeable world is referred to as the οἰκουμένη, confirming Vanhoye's suggestion.²²⁰ The coming world to be made subject to humanity of Heb 2:5 is the unshakeable kingdom of Heb 12:27

213 That Sinai is in view seems clear from the word τότε ("then"), probably referring back to vv. 18–21 (Ellingworth 1993: 686), although neither *σαλεύω* nor *σεῖω* appear in the Pentateuch.

214 See Caird 1970: 23, "[t]he author believes that he and his friends, transient creatures that they are have been given a share in the unshakable. The difference between the shakable and the unshakable, then, lies not in their natural status, but in their relationship to God . . . whatever gains his [God's] approval . . . is thereby made part of the unshakable kingdom." Others who read the text in this way include Hughes 1977: 558–59; Lane 1991b: 482; Ellingworth 1993: 687; O'Brien 2010: 496.

215 Chapter 6, above.

216 Vanhoye 1964: 250–53. Adams 2007: 189–90 (note 30) thinks Vanhoye is far too specific.

217 Ps 93 (LXX 92):1; 96 (LXX 95):10.

218 In Exod 13:16; Deut 6:8; 11:18 it refers to phylacteries.

219 There are too many to list. I note Ps 18:7 (LXX 17:8); 46 (LXX 45):6; 77:18 (LXX 76:19); 97 (LXX 96):4; 99 (LXX 98):1 where *σαλεύω* refers to the shaking of the earth. In Ps 82 (LXX 81):5 the foundations of the earth are shaken, and in Ps 96 (LXX 95):9 the whole earth is called upon to shake before the Lord. The same word appears in Matt 24:29; Mark 13:25; and Luke 21:26 in an eschatological context referring to the shaking of the powers of heaven.

220 The other two texts are 1 Chr 16:30, an alternative version of Ps 96, where the world is ἡ γῆ, and Ps 46 (LXX 45):5 where God is in the midst of the city of God, which therefore shall not be shaken. The connection with Haggai is also suggested by the LXX Psalm

that the readers are receiving, and the rebuilt temple context of Hag 2:6, as well as the imagery of the heavenly, eschatological temple in Heb 12:22–24, indicate that the coming world is to be seen as a temple. Once again, the heavenly temple is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.²²¹

On this reading, then, what is removed is not the created universe; it is the former means of access to God,²²² so that, as in Hag 2:6, the glory of the later temple can be greater than that of the former temple. However, in Hebrews, the later temple is not a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem as in Haggai.²²³ It is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come.

No Continuing City (13:10–16)

Hebrews 13 comprises a series of ethical instructions. Wedderburn questions its authenticity on the basis of a different style of argument from Heb 1–12, the significant number of words not found in the earlier chapters, what appears to be a different situation addressed and what he detects as a different understanding of the sacrificial cult.²²⁴ However, he stands almost alone among recent scholars in this opinion. Most conclude that this chapter is an integral part of Hebrews and forms a fitting conclusion to the book.²²⁵

heading, "Ὅτε ὁ οἶκος ᾠκοδομεῖτο μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν" ("when the house was built after the captivity").

221 Lane 1991b: 474–91; Beale 2004b: 301–6; Laansma 2008b: 12–16.

222 Laansma 2008b: 13–14. Laansma argues that this text anticipates "God's judgement, of cleansing (1:3), of removal of that which opposes God, and then of entrance into the place of salvation which goes under the name of heavenly tabernacle, city, *κατάπαυσις*, and so forth" (pp. 14–15). These ideas are similar to those found in Rev 21:1–2 where the new Jerusalem (already existing) comes down out of heaven from God.

223 Ibid.: 13. Beale 2004b: 115–16; 305–6 suggests that Haggai's prophecy may also transcend the limitations of a localised temple in Jerusalem. It is more likely, however, that Haggai was interested in the present building programme and the author of Hebrews is reading Haggai from his own eschatological perspective.

224 Wedderburn 2004: 390–405. Earlier scholars who have questioned the authenticity of Heb 13 include Héring 1970: 119; Buchanan 1972: 238–39, 267; Grässer 1990–97: 3: 409 (who doubts the authenticity of vv. 22–25). Isaacs 1992: 212 thinks it was an epistolary appendix added by the author.

225 For earlier studies arguing for the authenticity of Heb 13 see Williams 1911: 129–36; Filson 1967: 22–29; Vanhoye 1977: 121–39. Recent scholars accepting its authenticity and integrity include Attridge 1989: 384–85; Bruce 1990: 367–68; Lane 1991b: 495–98; Ellingworth 1993: 692–93; Guthrie 1994: 134; Koester 2001: 554; Thompson 2008: 273–74; Mosser 2009a: 397; Rothschild 2009: 46–62; O'Brien 2010: 502–3; Allen 2010: 603; Cockerill 2012: 674–75.

The central section of the chapter, vv. 7–19, is bounded by an inclusio referring to the leaders of the community. The readers are to remember their former leaders and imitate their faith (v. 7), to be “persuaded” (passive imperative of *πείθω*) by their leaders and to pray for the authors (plural), so that he (singular) would be restored to them soon.²²⁶ Within this section is the claim that Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, today and into the future (v. 8), and a charge not to be carried away by varieties of strange teaching, “since” (*γάρ*) it is good for them to be strengthened by grace rather than foods, which have proved to be of little benefit to “those who walk” (*οἱ περιπατοῦντες*) in them.²²⁷ The central part of the section, vv. 10–16, contains considerable cultic and temple imagery.

Hebrews 13:10–16 has a chiasmic structure, with vv. 10–12 containing exposition and vv. 13–16 containing exhortations based on that.²²⁸ Verses 10–12, the first three members of the chiasm, begin (v. 10) with the assertion that “we (the author and his readers) have an altar” (*ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον*) from which “those who serve (in) the tent” (*οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες*) are not permitted to eat. This is explained in v. 11 (beginning with *γάρ*) with reference to the burning

226 The switch from the plural (*προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν*, “pray for us”) in v. 18 to the singular (*περισσότερως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*, “and I encourage you to do this all the more”) may indicate joint authorship, as though the author was writing on behalf of himself and some other person, while he alone was hoping to visit them soon. The same switch occurs in 1 Thess 5:25–26.

227 Mosser 2009a: 402–3 detects a reference to “halakhic controversies” in the reference to “walking” in foods, following Attridge 1989: 394. I will not deal at length with this debated verse, although it is part of the larger section vv. 7–17 and, while it does have some cultic implications, temple imagery *per se* is absent. Lindars 1991: 10; Lane 1991b: 530–56; Walker 1994: 40–41 and Young 2002a: 253–55 suggest that the readers may have been joining their Jewish neighbours in communal synagogue meals (for this view see also Lehne 1990: 115–16). For useful summaries of other approaches to this text see Loader 1981: 178–79; Attridge 1989: 394–96; O’Brien 2010: 519–20.

228 Attridge 1989: 396. For the chiasmic structure see the diagram in Lane 1991b: 503. Several treatments of Heb 13 treat vv. 9–14 separately (Koester 1962; Thompson 1982: 141–51; Walker 1994) and, indeed, v. 9 refers to “food” (*βρώμα*) and v. 10 to “eating” (*ἐσθίω*) showing that there is some connection between vv. 9–10. However, my interest is in the temple symbolism in the chiasm in vv. 10–16. The connection between v. 9 and vv. 10–16 is not clarified until v. 13, where the readers are encouraged to exit the “camp,” which I argue below refers to Jewish cultic rituals centred on the temple. Koester 2001: 568 starts a new section at 13:10, and on pp. 560–61 argues that the “foods” are a general reference to “teachings that erode faith,” following Wilson 1987: 242; Grässer 1990–97: 3: 375–76; Weiss 1991: 720–22, but this obscures the connection between v. 9 and vv. 10–16.

of the bodies of sacrificial victims “outside the camp” (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς), with this explanation providing the rationale (v. 12, beginning with Διὸ καί, “therefore”) for the suffering of Jesus “outside the gate” (ἔξω τῆς πύλης).

The second three members of the chiasm comprise exhortations based on these assertions. “Since” (τοίνυν) Jesus suffered outside the gate, the readers are encouraged “to go out” (ἐξέρχονται) to him “outside the camp” (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, v. 13). The reason for this appeal is given in v. 14 (beginning with γάρ)—they have no continuing city, but are “intently seeking” (ἐπιζητέω) “the city to come” (ἡ πόλις ἡ μέλλουσα). Finally, vv. 15–16 encourage the readers to “offer” (ἀναφέρω) “a sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως), and direct them “not to forget” (μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, imperative) to do good deeds and share their possessions, for God is pleased with such “sacrifices” (θυσίαι).²²⁹ This reference to sacrifices that are pleasing (εὐαρεστέω) to God takes the reader back to 12:28 with its exhortation to acceptable worship (λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως), and indicates that these verses concern the worship of the community, announced in advance there.²³⁰

This pericope is so cryptic that some have identified it as the most difficult in Hebrews, if not in the entire NT, with several parts the subject of furious debate.²³¹ I start with the identity of the Christian altar, for which there have been five main suggestions: the eucharistic table, the cross, an altar in the heavenly sanctuary, Christ himself²³² or a metonym for the sacrifice of Christ.²³³

Of these, the eucharistic table, while it continues to have its adherents, should be discounted.²³⁴ It only arises when it is not recognised that v. 9 lies outside the chiasm of vv. 10–16, and v. 10 is read in the light of the reference to the “meals” (βρώμα) of v. 9. On this reading, v. 10 simply denies that those in view in this verse have any right to share in the Eucharist. Although Schierse

229 Note the inclusio in vv. 10, 16 with the “altar” (θυσιαστήριον) and the “sacrifices” (θυσία), although the particular sacrifices in view are not those that would be offered on the altar.

230 Swetnam 1974: 340. Note also the use of λατρεύω (“to serve”) for those who serve the “tent” (σκηνή) in 13:10, showing that in this pericope Christian worship/service is contrasted with the service of officials in what I will argue is the temple.

231 Schierse 1955: 184; Koester 1962: 299; Thompson 1982: 141.

232 For these four alternatives see Schierse 1955: 190–91, with references to earlier readers of Hebrews who have held these views. Those who see the altar as the eucharistic table include Strobel 1991: 179; DeSilva 1995: 275; 2000b: 499–500. Moffatt 1924: 233–34 and Braun 1984: 463–65 read vv. 9–10 as a critique of the community’s eucharistic practice, and Johnson 2006: 348, while not mentioning the Eucharist, sees the altar as a metonym for the Christian’s “share in worship consisting in praise and thanksgiving to God.”

233 Bruce 1990: 378–79.

234 Isaacs 1997: 277–80.

sees a merger of senses in the text (“behind the communion table stands the cross and it opens the heavenly sanctuary”),²³⁵ he ultimately reads the text in this way, and then, unsure what to do with vv. 11–12, passes over them hastily to discuss the exhortations of vv. 13–16.²³⁶ Moreover, there is no evidence that the eucharistic table was referred to as an altar prior to the second century²³⁷ and, indeed, if “meals” (βρῶμα) are unable to mediate grace (v. 9), then any reference to the eucharistic table is incongruous.²³⁸

An altar in the heavenly sanctuary should also be discounted as there is no evidence in Hebrews,²³⁹ or indeed elsewhere, for blood sacrifices in the heavenly sanctuary.²⁴⁰ Moreover, as I will argue in the following chapter, the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews symbolises the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. It is not a place of sacrifice. Identifying the altar with Christ himself is a possibility; however, he has already been identified as high priest and sacrifice (9:11–14) and it is difficult to imagine him as the altar as well.

It is difficult to decide whether to read the altar as referring to the sacrifice of Christ or to the cross,²⁴¹ but vv. 11–12 seem to indicate that a reference to the sacrifice of Christ makes the best sense, with perhaps a blending of these two referents.²⁴² “Those who serve (in) the tent” (οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες) are

235 Schierse 1955: 191, (“[h]inter dem Abendmahlstisch erhebt sich das Kreuz und öffnet sich das himmlische Heiligtum”).

236 Ibid.: 186–93.

237 Isaacs 1992: 215; Koester 2001: 569. The earliest reference to the eucharistic table as an altar is in Ignatius of Antioch, *Phld.* 4, in the first half of the second century (Holmes 2007: 170–71, 238–39).

238 Loader 1981: 179–81.

239 Lehne 1990: 115 argues for this on the grounds that “ἐχομεν consistently refers to the prophetic possession of heavenly realities by the addressees.” See Heb 4:15; 6:19; 8:1; 13:14. For an altar in the heavenly sanctuary see Filson 1967: 48–50; Williamson 1975: 308–9; Thompson 1982: 146; 2008: 282 and the critique in Isaacs 1992: 214; 1997: 273–77.

240 That blood sacrifices are in view is evident from the reference to blood in v. 11.

241 Westcott 1892: 437–38; Manson 1951: 149–56, both of whom allow for a secondary reference to the Eucharist. Similarly Ellingworth 1993: 711–12 proposes a “polysemous” interpretation.

242 Koester 2001: 568–69 combines the cross and the sacrifice of Christ, suggesting that it “encompasses multiple dimensions of Christ’s death.” Those who adopt this view include Spicq 1952: 2: 425; Montefiore 1964: 244–45; Hughes 1977: 574–78; Loader 1981: 180–81; Attridge 1989: 396; Lindars 1989: 389; Bruce 1990: 378–79; Lane 1991b: 538; Isaacs 1992: 216; 1997: 280; Johnson 2001: 117; O’Brien 2010: 51. Filson 1967: 49 excludes the cross on the understanding that the once and for all self-offering of Jesus was “made by blood in the heavenly sanctuary.” I argue against this reading in chapter 8, below.

the Levitical priests,²⁴³ and since these alone are excluded from eating at the Christian altar, rather than unbelievers, it seems clear that there is some cultic reason for their exclusion.²⁴⁴ Verse 11 gives this reason in terms of the burning of the bodies of certain sacrificial victims outside the camp. The text echoes Lev 16:27 where the bodies of the sacrificial animals are burned outside the camp. The Christian altar is the altar upon which Christ offered himself as the typological fulfilment of the Day of Atonement type of sacrifice, as in Heb 9:11–12.²⁴⁵ Verse 12 clarifies that this is the case, since, “for this reason” (διὸ καὶ)²⁴⁶ Jesus suffered ἔξω τῆς πόλεως (“outside the gate”—of Jerusalem).²⁴⁷

243 Peterson 1982: 134; Lehne 1990: 115–16; Ellingworth 1993: 710; Young 2002a: 246–47; O’Brien 2010: 522. That these priests are described as “serving (in) the tent” is anachronistic, since the “tent” (the wilderness sanctuary) was no longer standing. I argue in Church 2013b: 114–28, following Walker 1994: 39–71, 1996: 205–8 that the tent is a “deliberately archaised” reference to the temple, still standing when Hebrews was written, archaised as part of the author’s polemic against it. For the use of σκημή (“tent”) to refer to the Jerusalem temple see Sir 24:10–11. Braun 1984: 465, who sees this verse as a critique of the readers’ eucharistic practices, sees these priests as Christians in analogy with the priests of Lev 16. Similarly Moffatt 1924: 235 thinks of Christians serving in the heavenly sanctuary.

244 O’Brien 2010: 522 seems to miss this point, suggesting that the exclusion applies to any “adherents of the old cult” and to “those who conduct their lives under the Levitical system.”

245 Loader 1981: 180; Trudinger 1982: 236; Attridge 1989: 397–98; Lane 1991b: 538; Young 2002a: 246–47. Ellingworth 1993: 710 thinks that this is not the most natural meaning of the Greek, although he does not say what he thinks is most natural. One would normally expect that on this reading the relative pronoun in the expression ἔξ οὗ would be ὅστις rather than ὅς, indicating that the altar belongs to that class of altar (BDAG 729–30). As BDF 152–53, §293 indicates, the two forms of the relative pronoun “are no longer clearly distinguished in the NT . . . [and] ὅστις is virtually limited to the nom.” Here the preposition requires a genitive. ὅστις occurs one hundred and forty-four times in the NT and, apart from Matt 5:25; Luke 12:50; 13:8; 22:16; John 9:18 (all neuter genitive singular in the expression ἕως ὅτου), it is always in the nominative case. See Wilson 1939: 380.

246 Διὸ καὶ indicates that the inference that follows is “self-evident” (BDAG 250).

247 Koester 1962: 468; Thompson 1982: 147; Fuller Dow 2010: 176; Mosser 2009a: 398. It is clear that the physical city of Jerusalem is in view in this verse, given the Gospel traditions locating his death at Golgotha (although the detail that Golgotha was outside the gates of the city is not mentioned in Matt 27:33; Mark 15:22; Luke 23:33). John 19:20 notes that the location was near the city. It is outside the first century walls of Jerusalem, but inside the current walls of the old city. The point in Hebrews is not only historical, however, but to make a connection with the Day of Atonement. It carries with it the implication that Jesus was excluded from the sacred precincts of the city and died as an outcast (Lane 1991b: 541–42; O’Brien 2010: 523). P⁴⁶, P, 104 and a Bohairic MS read ἔξω τῆς

Three exhortations follow from this claim. First the readers are encouraged to “go out” (ἐξέρχουμαι) to Jesus “outside the camp” (ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς),²⁴⁸ “bearing his reproach” (ὀνειδισμός). While elsewhere in Hebrews, the readers are encouraged to approach (προσέρχουμαι, 4:16; 10:22); here, the movement is in the opposite direction, although the goal is the same—the presence of Jesus. This call to exit the camp and bear the reproach of Jesus is a call to suffer in the place where Jesus was executed.²⁴⁹

The precise referent of the expression “outside the camp” is debated. Thompson suggests that the readers are exhorted to follow Jesus into the transcendent (heavenly) world,²⁵⁰ an unlikely suggestion given that there would be no reproach involved there.²⁵¹ H. Koester thinks they are to leave the security of the Christian community and enter the secular world, with consequent exposure to uncleanness and harsh experiences,²⁵² yet elsewhere in Hebrews the death of Jesus sets people apart from the unclean world to pursue holiness

παρεμβολῆς (or the Coptic equivalent) here, probably an assimilation to this same expression in the immediate context.

248 The carcasses of sacrificial animals are burnt outside the camp (Exod 29:14; Lev 4:12, 21; 6:4; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27); Moses pitched the tent of “meeting” (Heb ԴԵՄԵ, LXX μαρτύριον—“witness”) outside the camp (Exod 33:7–8); Mishael and Elzaphan took the bodies of Nadab and Elihu outside the camp for burial (Lev 10:4, 5); those who slaughter animals either outside or inside the camp without presenting them to YHWH are cut off from the people (Lev 17:3); blasphemers are stoned outside the camp (Lev 24:14, 23); persons with leprosy live outside the camp (Lev 13:46; 14:3; Num 5:3, 4; 12:14, 15); the man who violated the Sabbath was stoned outside the camp (Num 15:36); the red heifer is slaughtered outside the camp (Num 19:3); and its ashes are deposited in a clean place outside the camp to be available for purification (19:9); Moses, Eleazar and the priests met the warriors who returned from battle outside the camp (Num 31:13); anyone who killed a person or touched a corpse had to remain outside the camp for seven days (Num 31:19); men who have nocturnal emissions must go outside the camp (Deut 23:11); latrines were to be located outside the camp (Deut 23:13); Rahab was saved from death in the battle of Jericho when she was taken outside the camp (Josh 6:23); and Achior is killed outside the camp (Jdt 6:11). Apart from the location of the tent of meeting outside the camp away from normal patterns of activity so as to indicate that it was a unique place, and apart from the location of the rescue of Rahab, “outside the camp” is a place of defilement, where carcasses were burnt, criminals executed and human excrement buried.

249 In bearing the reproach of Jesus the readers follow Moses who did the same (11:26). Reproach had also been the experience of the readers in their former persecution (10:33).

250 Thompson 1982: 147–49; 2008: 283. For the camp in Philo see *Leg.* 3.46; *Det.* 160; *Ebr.* 95–100; *Gig.* 54.

251 For this and other reasons Young 2002a: 256 dismisses Thompson's claim as “erroneous.” See also the critique in Koester 2001: 570–71.

252 Koester 1962: 301–3; Hughes 1977: 580–81.

and avoid defilement (12:10, 14).²⁵³ DeSilva hears a call to leave the security associated with the society in which they lived.²⁵⁴ It is more likely that there is an oblique reference to Judaism²⁵⁵ which v. 14 specifies more closely.²⁵⁶

253 Koester 2001: 571; Young 2002a: 255.

254 DeSilva 1995: 200; 2000b: 517. Attridge 1989: 399 envisages “the realm of security and traditional holiness, however that is grounded or understood”; Koester 2001: 571 refers to the need to “move outside the mainstream of urban life,” and hints that the “continuing city” that the readers do not have is Rome. This avoids what seem to be clear references to Jerusalem and Judaism in the context, and is too general. There is no suggestion elsewhere in Hebrews that an urban setting is an inappropriate place for the followers of Jesus to live.

255 Hughes 1977: 580–81; Loader 1981: 181; Bruce 1990: 381; Salevao 2002: 147; Haber 2005: 105–24. Some scholars who deny any polemic against Judaism in Hebrews may do so out of a desire to conform to the current “post-Holocaust rapprochement between Jews and Christians” (Young 2002a: 260), but Hebrews comes from a different era and, moreover, there is evidence elsewhere in the pages of the NT that the relationships between the Jewish leadership and the Christian community were strained (e.g. John 9; Acts 7). While it would be going too far to suggest that Hebrews was supersessionist or anti-Semitic, the reality is that this text claims that the sacrifice of Jesus rendered the Jewish sacrificial ritual obsolete, as it completed and filled out all that that ritual pointed to. The remarks of Hays 1989: 109 referring to Paul, who “simultaneously affirms and transmutes” the promises to Abraham in Gal 3:7, would apply to this author in terms of the temple cult. See the discussion on polemic in Hebrews in Young 2002a: 258–61 (partly in response to the claims of Thompson 1982: 142 that Hebrews is not polemical), and my own critique of the charge of supersessionism in Church 2011a: 147–57. On anti-Jewish polemic in Hebrews see Salevao 2002: 113–17, and Frevel 2010: 189–93 who concludes that in denying Israel a place in the land “Hebrews [3–4] does not provide a conscious and affective *anti-Judaism*, but an implicit substitution, and therefore a sort of *anti-Judaism*, one which has to be corrected by a focus on the remaining promises of the Torah.” Gordon 2008: 36–53 argues for what he refers to as “constitutional supersessionism” (p. 40) in Hebrews, but his proposal that “in Christ a new entity emerges from the ancestral religion of Israel that incorporates both Jews and non-Jews, that does not look to the old covenants conceived purely in ethnic terms, and that envisages the fulfilment of the ancient promises not only in the birth of the church but also in the ultimate blessing of the Jewish people through the Gospel” (p. 48) is not strictly supersessionist. It rather describes the affirmation and transmutation of the promises to Abraham through Christ. See also Gordon’s earlier discussion in 2000: 27–29, reproduced in 2008: 27–29.

256 In 4QMMT the “camp” is identified with Jerusalem (4Q394 3–7 II 16–19; 8 IV 10–11; 4Q396 III 1–2; 4Q397 3 3; 6–13 3–5), see Schiffman 1996: 79–80; McCarter 2000: 307–8; Mosser 2009a: 400–403.

Hebrews 13:14 contrasts “a continuing city” (μένουσα πόλις),²⁵⁷ which they “do not have here” (οὐ . . . ἔχομεν ὧδε), with a city “to come” (μέλλουσα), which they “eagerly expect” (ἐπιζητέω), the same word used in 11:14 of Abraham and the patriarchs who eagerly sought a homeland. This text contrasts²⁵⁸ the heavenly Jerusalem to come, and the earthly Jerusalem, either the physical city, or a cipher for Jewish ritual and the sacred associations of Judaism, centred in Jerusalem and temple.²⁵⁹

On this reading vv. 10–16 clarify the significance of the “meals” (βρώμα) of 13:9. These meals are not to be contrasted with the Eucharist, either positively or negatively; they were meals associated with Jewish rituals centred on the temple cultus in Jerusalem, and incompatible with attachment to Jesus who was excluded from that city and died as an outcast. They had therefore to be abandoned.²⁶⁰

Nevertheless, there are still sacrifices to be offered by those who exit the camp to follow Jesus. Through Jesus,²⁶¹ they are to continually “offer” (ἀναφέρω)

257 Cf. with this the claim of Heb 12:27, which refers to the removal of what can be shaken so that what cannot be shaken can “remain” (μένω). Just as some scholars read 12:27 as a reference to the coming destruction of Jerusalem, so also can this text be read in the same way. See Walker 1994: 46–49, 64–65; Mosser 2009a: 390–91.

258 See Attridge 1989: 399; Lane 1991b: 547; Ellingworth 1993: 718; O’Brien 2010: 525 for the chiasmic structure of v. 14 highlighting the contrast between the two cities. Nonetheless, Attridge 1989: 399 still detects “a quasi-Platonic dichotomy” here. The contrast, as in 11:8–16, is surely eschatological, as indicated by the expression “city to come.”

259 Bruce 1990: 381–82 argues that this text implies that what was formerly sacred—Jerusalem and the temple—is now unhallowed because Jesus was excluded, and what was formerly unhallowed is now sacred because Jesus is there. See the discussion in Lane 1991b: 544–46; Walker 1996: 216–17; Isaacs 1992: 217; Motyer 2004: 489; O’Brien 2010: 525. The earthly Jerusalem is nowhere referred to explicitly in Hebrews. Unlike other texts that identify Salem as Jerusalem (Ps 76:2; Josephus *Ant.* 1.180; 1QapGen XXII 13; Tg. Neof. Gen 14:18), Hebrews calls Melchizedek “king of Salem” (βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ), and interprets that as “king of peace” (7:2), ignoring the identification with Jerusalem. Burge 2010: 98 suggests that this is part of a strategy to direct attention to the heavenly city. Along the same lines, Walker 1996: 202 suggests that the author was not ignoring Jerusalem so much as ensuring a proper “approach” to Jerusalem, by which he means that it was a city they had to “discard” (p. 220), “. . . for now they had to forego their attachment to the earthly city” (p. 222). Fuller Dow 2010: 172 expresses a similar opinion.

260 Loader 1981: 180–81; Lindars 1989: 388–89; Walker 1996: 205–7.

261 There are some variant readings at the start of v. 15. NA²⁸ reads Δι’ αὐτοῦ [οὗν] (“through him, therefore”). The square brackets acknowledge that οὗν is omitted from P⁴⁶, the original hands of $\aleph$, and D, as well as P, Ψ . The second corrector of $\aleph$ added it as did the first corrector of D, and it is present in A, C, numerous minuscules, the Majority Text

“a sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως) to God, defined as the fruit of lips that confess the name of Jesus, and to do good and share their possessions, actions described as “sacrifices” (θυσίαι) that please God. The use of the language of sacrifice is ironic in the context of an exhortation to exit Jerusalem and the temple. Its poignancy would not have been lost on the recipients of Hebrews.²⁶²

The expression θυσία αἰνέσεως only appears here in the NT, but is more frequent in the LXX. The defining text is Lev 7:11–15, where it refers to “a thanksgiving offering” (זבח תודה),²⁶³ one class of an “offering of well-being” (זבח השלמים).²⁶⁴ And while the regulations in Leviticus refer to various leavened and unleavened cakes, Hebrews redefines the offering as the fruit of lips that confess the name of Jesus (καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). The expression “fruit of lips” appears in Hos 14:2 (LXX 14:3) where the people are given a liturgy for a prayer for forgiveness, including a promise to “repay” (ἀνταποδίδωμι) the fruit of their lips, that is, put their words into action by fulfilling their vows of repentance.²⁶⁵ In Hebrews, as in Hosea, sacrificial

and Latin and Syriac versions. The evidence is evenly weighted and οὖν could have been accidentally omitted in transcription, or added by a scribe who thought it necessary. See Ellingworth 1993: 720; Metzger 1994: 605. MS K (ninth century) and a few other MSS read διὰ τοῦτο οὖν, (“because of this, then”), which, while it makes sense, is too late to be seriously entertained.

- 262 O'Brien 2010: 527 suggests that the genitive αἰνέσεως (“of praise”) is epexegetical, suggesting that the expression means “a sacrifice consisting of praise.” While this might be correct, it is the appositive that follows, τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ (“that is the fruit of lips that confess his name”) that gives this sense. The original readers would have heard an echo of Lev 7:11–15 where this was a ritual prescribed by the Torah, see Mosser 2009a: 388–89, and notes 19–20.
- 263 The reference in the Göttingen LXX is Lev 7:2–4, while the Rahlfs LXX reflects the MT and English versification (7:12–15).
- 264 The translation “offering of well-being” is from the NRSV. The LXX translates the term in Lev 7:11–15 with θυσία σωτηρίου (“sacrifice of salvation”), that is, an offering for salvation. See the discussion in HALOT 1537–38 and the excursus on the offering of well-being in Hartley 1992: 37–40. Hartley notes that the offering is shared by the presenter's family, the priest and God, and that it demonstrates harmony between the family and God. Milgrom 2004: 28–29 notes the defining characteristic of all three sub-classes of the offering of well-being is joy and that it is the “spontaneous byproduct of one's happiness, whatsoever its cause.”
- 265 Stuart 1987: 213. Stuart notes that an Israelite who appeared before YHWH was not supposed to appear empty-handed (Exod 23:15; 34:20), but to bring a sacrificial offering. In Hosea no offering was called for, since YHWH wanted obedience rather than sacrifice (Hos 6:6; 8:13). For similar ideas see Ps 51:15 (LXX 50:17); 63:3 (LXX 62:4), 5 (LXX 62:6); 71 (LXX 70):23; 119 (LXX 118): 171.

language is put to use in terms of speech. A similar phenomenon is encountered at Qumran, where the community (which had withdrawn from the temple) transferred the language of sacrifice to speech in honour of God.²⁶⁶ As at Qumran, so also in Hebrews, sacrificial language is used figuratively to refer to the words the community uses in its liturgy.²⁶⁷ Finally, the language of sacrifice also appears in v. 16 where good deeds and acts of generosity are described as “sacrifices” (θυσία) that are pleasing to God.

The language of sacrifice here is of course figurative language. The once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ, who offered himself, has put an end to the earthly temple and its sacrificial ritual, and makes the idea of any of the appurtenances of sacrifice in the heavenly temple superfluous. While the life of a Christian is characterised by sacrifices offered to God, they are sacrifices that express gratitude for his saving deeds in the past (12:28) and anticipate the consummation of their salvation when God and his people will dwell together in the eschaton.²⁶⁸

266 See 4Q400 2 7; 1QS VIII 9–11; IX 4–5. See also Pss. Sol. 15:3. For the notion that good deeds and praise were preferable to sacrifice see Ps 51:15–17; Hos 6:6; Sir 34:18–35:11; T. Levi 3:5–6.

267 This phenomenon is not unique to Qumran and the NT. In Ps 107 (LXX 106):22 those who have been healed from sickness are to “offer” (θύω) a “sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως) and “tell of God’s deeds with joy” (ἐξαγγεῖλάτωσαν τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει). The word for the offering of this “sacrifice” (ἀναφέρω), appears elsewhere in Hebrews to refer to the self-offering of Christ (7:27), and also for his bearing the sins of the people (9:28). Ἀναφέρω appears to be a technical term in Leviticus at least for the actions of the priest in bringing the offering and placing it on the altar (Harris 1978: 1196–97); see e.g. Lev 3:6–16 where in vv. 6, 9 the actions of the offeror are described with προσφέρω, while the actions of the priest are described in vv. 5, 11, 14, 16 with ἀναφέρω. See also Lev 4:10, 19, 26, 31 and many other texts in Leviticus. Ἀναφέρω is also used for Noah’s offering in Gen 8:20; Abraham’s offering at the *Aqedah* in Gen 22:2, 13; Saul’s offering in 1 Kgdms 13:9–10; David’s offering when he brought the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem in 2 Kgdms 6:17; 1 Chr 16:2; and Solomon’s offering at the dedication of the temple in 2 Chr 8:12. There is a departure from this usage in 2 Chr 29:21–32 where ἀναφέρω describes the actions of the priests in vv. 27, 29, as well as the actions of the officials in bringing the animals to the priests (v. 21), and in vv. 31–32 of the community in bringing their “sacrifices” (θυσία) and “thanksgiving offerings” (ἀνέσεις).

268 Cf. Attridge 1989: 401, “[t]he new covenant community has a cult that is quite outside the realm of the cultic.”

Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined texts in Hebrews in which the people of God have access to the heavenly temple. In one text, this access is in the present (12:22–24) and in other texts it is in the future as their eschatological goal (3–4; 11:8–16; 12:18–29; 13:10–16). That this access is available in the present demonstrates that the heavenly temple is a metaphor for God's dwelling with his people. The eschatological aspects of this dwelling of God grow out of the eschatological orientation of Hebrews. The world to come (2:5) is the ultimate goal. Along with this is a critique of the old order symbolised by Jerusalem and the temple. As in other texts discussed in Part 1 of this study, the Jerusalem temple is not mentioned. However, polemic against the temple and its ritual surfaces in 13:10–16 where the readers are to exit Jerusalem and go to where Jesus is. But, unlike those texts, dissatisfaction with the temple is not because of a corrupt priesthood; rather it is because what the temple and its ritual pointed to has now come. The former things are passing away in favour of the things to come; that is, the temple not made with hands, which God has prepared in which to dwell with his people.

This chapter builds on the previous chapter and demonstrates how the eschatological orientation of Hebrews functions with respect to the people of God. In the following chapter I will demonstrate how the central part of Hebrews (4:14–10:18) is consistent with this orientation, and that the heavenly temple is a symbolic reference to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

Jesus the High Priest of the Heavenly Temple: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 4:14–10:25

Introduction

The central section of Hebrews (4:14–10:25) deals with the priesthood of Christ and his unique self-offering by which forgiveness is achieved, enabling access for God's people to God's presence, pictured as a temple. In this chapter I examine the claims that this part of Hebrews makes about this temple. I note at the outset that this is not a study of the high priestly Christology of Hebrews, an important topic in its own right;¹ rather, it is an exploration of temple symbolism in Hebrews. However, high priestly Christology is significant to the extent that it impinges on this discussion, and I will discuss it at various places. The perspective for which I argue is that the heavenly temple is not to be understood as the heavenly archetype of the wilderness tabernacle as is often claimed. Rather, as in the opening and closing sections (Heb 1:1–4:13; 10:26–13:25), it symbolises the dwelling of God with his people in the last days.

Access to the Heavenly Temple in the Present (4:14–16; 10:19–25)

Hebrews 4:14–16 and 10:19–25 form an *inclusio* around the central section of Hebrews (5:1–10:18). Each contains the present subjunctive of προσέρχομαι (“let us approach”), part of an exhortation based the participial clause ἔχοντες οὖν . . . (“so then, since [we] have . . .”). In 4:14–16 the author and readers are said to have “a great high priest” (ἄρχιερεὺς μέγας) and in 10:19–25 they have “a great priest” (ἱερεὺς μέγας), and in both texts this priest/high priest is identified as Jesus. In 4:14–16 they are exhorted to approach with “confidence” (παρρησία) and in 10:19–25 they are said to have “confidence” (παρρησία). In 4:14–16 they are encouraged to “hold on” (κρατέω) to the “confession” (ὁμολογία), as also in 10:19–25, although there the verb is κατέχω (“hold fast”).²

1 This is the emphasis of Cody 1960; Gäbel 2006.

2 See Nauck 1960: 203–4 for a discussion of the implications of this *inclusio*.

Both pericopes assume that the recipients have proleptic access to the heavenly temple in the present, although in neither is a heavenly journey necessary. Thus the heavenly temple encompasses earth and heaven. I deal first with 4:14–16, which I will argue, envisages Jesus ministering before God in heaven and encourages the readers on that basis to approach God in prayer. Then I deal with 10:19–25 which uses considerable temple symbolism, again to encourage them to take advantage of the free access that they have to God's presence through the priestly ministry of Jesus.

A Great High Priest Ministering in the Heavens (4:14–16)

In this pericope the text transitions from the discussion of God's rest (3:7–4:11) to the discussion of the priesthood of Christ and the heavenly sanctuary that encompasses Heb 5–10. The text identifies Jesus as a ("great") high priest" (ἀρχιερεύς μέγας) for the third time and draws some inferences from this.³ It describes his priesthood with what I will argue is a reference to his ongoing ministry in the presence of God (4:14), and then explains why this priest who ministers in the presence of God is able to sympathise with our weaknesses (4:15). Intermingled with these descriptions are two exhortations: the readers are encouraged to hold fast their confession (4:14b) and to approach the throne of grace (ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος) to find mercy and grace in their time of need (4:16).

Hebrews is quite clear that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, indicating that his priestly work is complete, especially in Heb 10:11–13, where, in contrast to the former priests who stand day after day, ministering and offering sacrifices, he sits, waiting for the subjugation of his enemies. But elsewhere in Hebrews Jesus does seem to have an ongoing priestly role. In 8:1 he is described as a minister of the sanctuary (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός), in 7:25 he is said to live to intercede (ἐντυγχάνω) for those who approach God through him, and in 9:24 he enters heaven itself to "appear" (ἐμφανίζω) in God's presence on our behalf. Hay describes Heb 7:25 as a "foreign body" in the theology of Hebrews.⁴ But, foreign body or not, this strand is present and needs to be considered.⁵

3 The conjunction οὖν ("therefore") in 4:14 relates back to the claims of 2:17 and 3:1 that he is a high priest. Thus, as well as introducing 5:1–10:18, 4:14–16 also draws inferences from what has preceded. See Ellingworth 1993: 266; Thompson 2008: 104; O'Brien 2010: 180; Cockerill 2012: 221–22; Calaway 2013: 61–62 (note 13).

4 Hay 1973: 132.

5 Bruce 1990: 174 suggests that 7:25 may have been part of an early Christian confession as does Hay 1973: 132. Cockerill 2012: 336–37, who also refers to Heb 4:14–16 and 10:19–25 in connection with Jesus ongoing priestly work, suggests that this strand in Hebrews is

In what follows I argue that it is also present in Heb 4:14, which, in the NRSV, as in most English versions, refers to Jesus as “a great high priest who has passed through the heavens.”⁶ I propose that this text is a further reference to Jesus’ ongoing priestly service in the presence of God.⁷ It is this, not his prior ascension “through the heavens” that is used to motivate the readers to approach the throne of grace.⁸

Recent commentators on Hebrews are unanimous in reading the verb διέρχομαι in Heb 4:14 with reference to Jesus’ ascension, when he passed through layers of heaven or perhaps the visible heavens, until he reached the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary.⁹ Several draw an analogy between this and the progress of the former high priest through the outer court of the tabernacle into the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement.¹⁰ All this seems reasonable, given that the author sees Jesus’ offering of himself as a typological fulfilment of the Day of Atonement ceremony, and also claims that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God, presumably in the heavenly holy of holies. But I am not sure that it will withstand close examination. Indeed, a reference to a heavenly journey on the part of Jesus, appearing Melchizedek-like in Heb 4:14 and then disappearing without trace, is the real foreign body in the book. Moreover, the “heavenly journey” narratives in Second Temple literature give extensive detail of what the traveller encounters in each level of heaven.¹¹ There

intended to encourage the recipients, “knowing that he [Christ] represents them before God.”

- 6 The 1984 NIV had a similar reading. The 2011 NIV refers to Jesus having “ascended into heaven.”
- 7 Moffitt 2011: 206, 220 uses Heb 4:14 as evidence that the author sees Jesus as “in heaven.” Calaway 2013: 158 suggests that Heb 4:14 emphasises “Jesus’ continual intercessory role” along with Heb 7:25 and 9:24.
- 8 Of course the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God presupposed his ascension. I simply argue that this is not in view in this text.
- 9 Among nineteenth century commentators see Delitzsch 1868: 1: 219 and Westcott 1892: 105–6. A sampling of more recent works includes Spicq 1952: 2: 91 (Spicq refers to the “seven heavens” through which Jesus passed); Michel 1975: 204–5; Jewett 1981: 81 (Jewett refers to “a gnostic theology in which redemption is thought of as ascent through the hostile cosmic spheres to the spiritual homeland”); Käsemann 1984: 228; Attridge 1989: 139; Lane 1991a: 103; Ellingworth 1993: 266–67; DeSilva 2000b: 181; Johnson 2006: 139–40; O’Brien 2010: 179–81; Moffitt 2011: 143–44, 180, 199; Barnard 2012: 114–18.
- 10 Holtzmann 1926: 2: 789 appears to be the first to have made this suggestion, followed by Gallinger 1950: 263–64. See also (e.g.) Kistemaker 1984: 124; Bruce 1990: 115; Koester 2001: 282; Thompson 2008: 104–5; Cockerill 2012: 224.
- 11 In Part One I have discussed heavenly journeys in 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch, T. Levi, The Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the Apocalypse of Abraham, and 3 (Greek-Slavonic) Baruch. Schenck 2007:

is none of this in Hebrews. Thus, I will argue that Heb 4:14 (“Ἐχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς”) claims not that Jesus has “passed through the heavens” but that he is “a great high priest ministering in the heavens.”

In Hebrews, as elsewhere in the NT, οὐρανός has two senses:¹² it refers either to the upper part of the created universe (i.e. the sky) or the transcendent dwelling place of God. The former sense is clear in three places, all OT quotations or allusions: Heb 1:10–12 quotes Ps 102:25–27 (LXX 101:26–28) referring to the created heavens and earth that will be changed; Heb 11:12 alludes to the promise that Abraham would have descendants as the stars of heaven; and Heb 12:26 quotes Hag 2:6 where God announces that he will shake both earth and heaven.¹³ Normally in this sense the word is in the singular,¹⁴ although it is plural in Heb 1:10, following the LXX.

When οὐρανός refers to the transcendent dwelling place of God it is normally in the plural.¹⁵ In Heb 8:1 Jesus is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); in Heb 9:23 “the outlines of the things in heaven” (τὰ . . . ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) require cleansing; in 12:23 the firstborn ones are “enrolled in heaven” (ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς); and in 12:25 God warns “from heaven” (ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν). This usage also occurs in

174 finds that Hebrews “lacks those distinct indicators of progression through multiple heavens which 1 *Enoch* and *TLevi* clearly have.” On the other hand Barnard 2012: 114–18 sees close connections between the Qumran Sabbath Songs and Hebrews. He suggests that Jesus passed “through the heavens (Heb 4:14)—by way of the heavenly tabernacle (9:11), beyond the veil (6:19–20), into the Holy of Holies (9:12, 24), to the throne of the King (8:1–2). In this chapter I argue against such readings of these texts.

12 Cody 1960: 77–86 finds three perspectives on heaven in Hebrews. He refers to a cosmological perspective (the created heavens) in such texts as 1:10–12; 12:26–27, an axiological perspective in such texts as 8:1, where Christ is exalted in heaven, and an eschatological perspective in 12:28. Cody takes his axiological perspective from Philo and Middle Platonism, where heaven is understood to be the realm that has ultimate value, and earth, which has derived value, is secondary, “defective and shadowy” (p. 82). I will demonstrate below that this is inadequate. Koester 2001: 99 suggests that the author does not clearly distinguish between the created heavens and the transcendent heavens where God dwells, but this too seems not to be the case. See DeSilva 2000b: 37–32, and Adams 2009: 130–32. Michel 1975: 311–12 posits three senses for οὐρανός in Hebrews: the visible heavens, the heavens through which Jesus passed and the actual dwelling place of God. Peterson 1982: 143, seems to agree with Michel at this point. See now the discussion in Schenck 2007: 157–58, 178–79, who finds Michel’s hypothesis “unnecessary” (p. 179).

13 BDAG 737–39, s.v. οὐρανός, 1, 2. BDAG also lists a third sense where οὐρανός is a periphrasis for God, e.g. Luke 15:18, 21. This sense does not feature in Hebrews.

14 BDF: 77–78, § 141 (1).

15 BDF: 77–78, § 141 (1); BDAG 738.

the singular in Heb 9:24, where Jesus is said to have entered “heaven itself” (εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν).¹⁶ Aside from these texts, οὐρανός appears in 4:14 and 7:26. In both texts it could refer either to the created heavens or to the dwelling place of God.¹⁷ Given that the word is in the plural in both places, it is likely that both refer to the dwelling place of God. If so, it is difficult to understand the sense in which Jesus can have “passed through” the dwelling place of God. Either the author is using the plural of οὐρανός in an unusual sense to refer to the sky, or the perfect participle of διέρχομαι has a sense other than “passed though.”

Διέρχομαι appears forty-three times in the NT, but this is its sole occurrence in Hebrews and only here is it an adjectival perfect participle. According to BDAG it has three senses.¹⁸ It can refer to something penetrating an object as in Luke 2:35 where a sword “penetrates” the soul of Mary; it can refer to someone progressing through a geographical location, as in John 4:4, where Jesus “passes

16 There appears to be no reason for the switch from plural to singular in Heb 9:23, 24 (BDAG 738, s.v. οὐρανός, 1, e). Cockerill 2012: 418 (n. 19) suggests that that it is “unmistakeable evidence that the pastor is not dealing with a two-part heavenly Sanctuary.” Cockerill also denies a two-part sanctuary in connection with 4:14 (p. 224), but does suggest that Jesus “passed through whatever levels of heaven there may be into the place where God dwells,” which sounds like Michel’s third category of heaven (see footnote 13, above). Schenck 2007: 173–75 discusses three possible readings of this text and argues that it refers to heaven as a whole. Barnard 2012: 116–18 considers “heaven itself” in 9:24 is the highest heaven.

17 I deal with Heb 7:26 where Jesus is said to be exalted above the heavens later in this chapter. A further text that has a bearing on the reading of these two texts is 9:11–12, which some have read as claiming that Jesus passed through the created heavens into the transcendent heavens. I argue against this reading later in the chapter.

18 BDAG 244. *LSJ* 425–26 is more comprehensive, with two main senses, first “*go through, pass through*,” with five specific examples, referring to (1) completing the course of something (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.25.4, completing a fifth part of a journey), (2) a report spreading about (e.g. Luke 5:15), (3) pain, passion or a thought passing through a person (e.g. Sophocles, *Phil.* 743), (4) passing through and reaching a goal (e.g., Pindar, *Isthm.* 4.5) and (5) the recounting of details (e.g. Aeschylus, *Prom.* 874). The other main sense in *LSJ* refers to the passage of time. While *LSJ* does not list a separate sense of “moving around within a region,” which is what I argue for Heb 4:14, the editors refer to Acts 9:32, Πέτρον διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων, which NRSV translates “Peter went here and there among the believers,” and NIV 2011, “As Peter traveled about the country.” In this sentence διέρχομαι is a participle, and the main verb referring to the eventual goal of Peter’s travels is κατέρχομαι (“to go down, descend”—in this case to Lydda). BDAG 244 lists the sense of “going over something in one’s mind,” although not appearing in the NT.

through” Samaria. The third sense refers to someone moving around within a region as in Acts 20:25, where Paul claims that he has been “going about” proclaiming the kingdom among the people of Ephesus. I will argue that the third sense gives a more satisfactory reading of Heb 4:14, which pictures not the ascension of Jesus, but Jesus “moving about” or ministering before God in heaven temple. My argument is based on reading διέρχομαι in Heb 4:14 as an intertextual echo of the same word in 1 Sam 2:30, 35, where it is a metaphor for priestly service. I am conscious that this is a novel reading, supported by no other Hebrews commentator;¹⁹ however, Chrysostom seems to reflect it in his comment on this verse, where he refers to Jesus’ present location rather than his ascension.²⁰

In my discussion of Heb 2:9,²¹ I argued that perfect passive participles should be understood as expressing imperfective aspect, where the action expressed takes place contemporaneously with the main verb, rather than as the present result of some past action, and I propose the same for the perfect active participle in this verse (and elsewhere in Hebrews). Indeed, antecedence is more naturally expressed by an aorist participle,²² as in Heb 2:2, for example. That text refers to “the message (previously) spoken though angels” (ὁ δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθείς λόγος). Thus, if the author had antecedence in mind in 4:14 one would expect an aorist participle as in 2:2 and in several other places in Hebrews.²³

19 Ellingworth 1993: 266–67 considers, and discounts this option.

20 In discussion of the exhortation that the readers hold fast to their confession, Chrysostom *Hom. Heb.* 7, (see PG 63) lists a variety of articles of faith that the readers are to continue hold firmly, and then claims that it is “evident they are true because the high priest is ‘within’” (δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ τὸν ἀρχιερέα ἔνδον εἶναι). Chrysostom does not explain his point, but, significantly, he refers to Jesus’ location rather than to his ascension in this context. The adverb ἔνδον is absent from the NT, but appears in 2 Macc 6:4 to refer to things being brought into the temple for sacrifice, in 3 Bar. 2:3 to refer to a level place in heaven and several times in Josephus and Philo with reference to things within the temple. See Josephus *Ant.* 3.125; 8.105, 115; 18.74; *J. W.* 1.152; 2.411; 4.278; 5.100, 211, 241, 565; 6.248, 260, 299; Philo *Deus* 132; *Ebr.* 85; *Her.* 82, 84; *Mos.* 2.101, 152, *Spec.* 1.72, 276; *Legat.* 319. In Homer (*Il.* 20.13) it refers to the gods gathered in the house of Zeus.

21 Chapter 6, above.

22 Campbell 2008a: 121.

23 Other examples of adjectival aorist participles in Hebrews with an antecedent sense include Heb 6:7 referring to “ground that has drunk the repeated rain falling upon it producing a crop” (γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιούσα τὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετὸν καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην); 6:10 where the readers are described as “having served and serving the saints” (διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες); and 8:5 where Moses is warned to make the tabernacle according to “the pattern shown to him” (τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα).

An analysis of the perfect active participles in Hebrews shows that Campbell's understanding is substantially correct.²⁴ There are seven of these,²⁵ three of which are in periphrastic constructions (2:13; 7:20, 23), with the same sense as a finite verb.²⁶ Of the remainder, aside from 4:14, two act as attributive adjectives and one as a substantive. I limit my discussion to the adjectival uses.

In Heb 7:5 the participle is in a noun phrase qualifying the word "kindred" (ἀδελφοί) as "emerging from the loins of Abraham" (ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ). If the participle is understood to convey imperfective aspect, then the author is referring to the descendants of Abraham emerging throughout history from the time of Abraham onwards and in to the present. These are they from whom the descendants of Levi collect tithes. But the point of the text seems not to be a description of their emergence in the past from one of Abraham's descendants, but rather to simply describe them as Abraham's descendants.²⁷

The other example is in Heb 9:9 where it describes "the present time" (τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα). Here there is no sense of antecedent action with ongoing results. The time that has *now arrived* is in view. It seems to be a case of over-exegesis to suggest that the author was using the perfect to make the point that the present time was the present result of the passage of time in the past.²⁸ These two perfect active participles are adequately explained as expressing imperfective aspect, and as I will show this also adequately explains the perfect active participle of διέρχομαι in Heb 4:14.

Διέρχομαι appears more than one hundred and fifty times in the LXX. It appears seventeen times in Joshua to describe the ways that the tribal borders of the land pass through various territories, and also in the Psalms with a variety of senses. In Deut 2:7 and Judg 11:18 it refers to the passage of the Israelites through the wilderness, two texts that could be relevant here in Hebrews given the discussion of Ps 95 in Heb 3–4. Interestingly, it is never

24 I do note that Campbell 2008a: 111 claims that a perfect participle "*nearly always* expresses action that is contemporaneous with its leading verb" (emphasis added).

25 Heb 2:3; 4:14; 7:5, 20, 23; 9:9; 12:3.

26 Campbell 2008b: 32.

27 Both the NRSV and the NIV translate this expression with "are descended from Abraham," which seems to adequately capture the sense. This reading seems not to include any notion of antecedence.

28 See the discussion of this expression in Oepke 1967: 2: 543–44. Similar expressions appear in Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 3:22; 7:26 ("the impending crisis," NRSV—see BDAG 337, s.v. ἐνίστημι, 3); Gal 1:4. The perfect indicative appears in 2 Thess 2:2, where the readers are warned against being alarmed by anyone suggesting that the day of the Lord had arrived. See the discussion in LSJ 568–69.

used to refer to the movement of the high priest through the tabernacle on the Day of Atonement, although in several texts it does appear in cultic contexts. In Ps 42:4 (LXX 41:5) “David” anticipates proceeding “to a place of a marvellous tent as far as the house of God” (διελεύσομαι ἐν τόπῳ σκηνῆς θαυμαστῆς ἕως τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ);²⁹ in 2 Kgdms 7:7 and 1 Chr 17:6 it translates the Hithpael of הלך, describing YHWH’s “moving about” among Israel, in a context that suggests his movement in the tabernacle;³⁰ in Joel 4:17 YHWH claims that he dwells in Zion and strangers shall never “pass through” (διέρχονται) it; and in Ezek 44:2 the east gate of the temple is closed and, since YHWH has “entered” (εἰσέρχονται) there nobody else is permitted to “pass through” (διέρχονται) it.

While any of these texts could have a bearing on Heb 4:14, the most significant background to this text is 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 2:30–35, already echoed in Heb 2:17 and 3:1–6.³¹ Here, a man of God announces to Eli that the priesthood would be taken from him. In v. 30 he explains that YHWH had chosen his ancestors to “walk before me forever” (יתהלכו לפני עד עולם, LXX διελεύσεται ἐνώπιόν μου ἕως αἰῶνος); and in v. 35 he explains that YHWH would raise up a “faithful priest” (כהן נאמן, LXX ἱερεὺς πιστός) for whom he would build “a sure house” (οἶκος πιστός), and who would “walk before my [YHWH’s] anointed forever” (והתהלך לפני משיחי כל הימים, LXX καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας).

29 This translation is from Pietersma 2009: 568. As Kraus 1988: 435 notes the MT of Ps 42:5 is unintelligible as it stands, and he proposes emending the expression אֲדִירָם בְּסֶדֶךָ (NRSV “with the throng, and led them...”) to אֲדִיר בְּסֶדֶךָ and translates “the tent of the glorious Lord,” that is, the temple, a reading corroborated by the parallel expression בֵּית אֱלֹהִים in the next line.

30 The Hithpael of הלך appears several times in cultic contexts in the OT. Here (2 Sam 7:7; 1 Chr 17:6) YHWH “walks” among the people of Israel (in a portable sanctuary); in Job 22:14 YHWH “walks” on the dome of heaven; and in Ps 26:3; 56:14; 116:9 the psalmist “walks” with or before God. In Gen 3:8 YHWH “walks” in Eden; in Ezek 1:3 the torch “walks” about the temple, and the king of Tyre “walks” in the Eden sanctuary (Ezek 28:14). See the discussion of this sense of the verb in Wenham 1986: 20. See also my discussion of 1QH^a XI 21 in chapter 3 (above), where the Hebrew verb describes the speaker in the hymn walking about heaven. The word refers to the manner of life of significant people from Israel’s past, including Enoch (Gen 5:22, 24), Noah (Gen 6:9), Abraham (Gen 17:1; 24:40), Hezekiah (2 Kings 20:3; Isa 38:3), Job (Job 1:7; 2:2). In Gen 5:22, 24 Enoch “walks” with God (התהלך). The LXX renders this with εὐαρεστέω (“to please”). VanderKam 2001: 133–34 and Kvanvig 2004: 171–73 suggest that “Enoch walked with God” (יתהלך חנוך את האלהים) may have been read by the composers of 1 Enoch in terms of Enoch’s sojourn with angels. If so, they would have read the hithpael of הלך in this text as referring to movement around the heavenly temple.

31 See my discussion of this text in chapter 7, above.

In Heb 4:14, Jesus is designated a “great high priest” (ἀρχιερέως μέγας) and, while scholars debate the force of the epithet “great,”³² the text appears to echo both Zech 6:11, where Joshua “the high priest” (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας) is singled out as the one who would build the eschatological temple.³³ It also seems to pick up the echo of 1 Sam 2:35 in Heb 2:17 and 3:1–6 where YHWH promises that he will raise up a “faithful priest” (ἱερεὺς πιστός) for whom he would build a sure house.³⁴ These three texts in Hebrews (2:17; 3:1–6; 4:14) identify Jesus as the “faithful priest” of that text, the one whom YHWH will raise up and for whom YHWH will build a sure house, and who will “walk about” (התהלך, διέρχομαι, “minister”) before YHWH’s anointed forever. Jesus is the one who ministers in the sure house, now in place with his exaltation to God’s right hand “in these last days” (Heb 1:2).

In 1 Sam 2 the faithful priest was probably Zadok (1 Kings 2:35), but the author of Hebrews read the text with reference to Jesus. Hebrews 4:14 should not be read with reference to the ascension of Jesus and his antecedent

32 The expression ἀρχιερέως μέγας is applied to Simon in 1 Macc 13:42; 14:27, and ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας applied to Joshua in Zech 6:11. Philo, *Somn.* 1.214, 219; 2.183, refers to the Logos as ἀρχιερέως μέγας. Moffatt 1924: 58; Hering 1970: 35; Wilson 1987: 91 posit dependence on Philo, while Spicq 1952: 1: 42; Montefiore 1964: 90; Hering 1970: 35; Ellingworth 1993: 266 suggest that the adjective is redundant. See the discussion in Williamson 1970: 130–32. Attridge 1989: 139 and O’Brien 2010: 180–81 suggest the adjective μέγας in Heb 4:14 differentiates Jesus from the Aaronic high priests and indicates that his priesthood is superior to theirs. Schenk 1980: 246–47, noting that the adjective μέγας is absent in 4:15, proposes that the greatness is connected with his presence in heaven. In Heb 10:21 Jesus is a “great priest” (ἱερεὺς μέγας) and in 13:20 he is “the great shepherd of the sheep” (ὁ ποιμὴν τῶν προβάτων ὁ μέγας). The word ἀρχιερέως is rare in the OT. In Lev 4:3 it translates הכהן המשיח (“the anointed priest”), in Josh 22:13 (MT) Phinehas is a “priest” (כהן, LXX “high priest,” ἀρχιερέως), and in Josh 24:33 the LXX reads Ελεάζαρ υἱὸς Ααρων ὁ ἀρχιερέως (“Eleazar the son of Aaron the high priest”) where the MT simply has ואליעזר בן אהרן (“and Eleazar the son of Aaron”). Aside from these verses where there is a Hebrew *Vorlage*, the word appears in four times in 1 Esd (5:40; 9:39, 40, 49); nineteen times in 1 Maccabees (which probably has a Hebrew *Vorlage*, see DeSilva 2002: 247) 10:20, 32, 38, 69; 12:3, 6, 7; 13:36, 42; 14:17, 23, 27, 30, 41; 15:17, 21, 24; 16:12, 24); twelve times in 2 Maccabees (3:1, 4, 9, 10, 16, 21, 32, 33, 4:13; 14:3, 13; 15:2); twice in 3 Maccabees (1:11; 2:1); and twice in 4 Maccabees (4:13, 16). The usual Hebrew expression is הכהן הגדול, appearing numerous times, translated with ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας.

33 In my discussion of Heb 8:1–2 (below), I identify a second allusion to Zech 6:11–13.

34 The echo is clearer in Heb 2:17, since only in that text and 1 Sam 2:35 is ἱερεὺς (or in the case of Heb 2:17, ἀρχιερέως) qualified with the adjective πιστός. As I noted in footnote 3 to this chapter, the οὖν in Heb 4:14 picks up the reference to Jesus being a high priest in 2:17 and 3:1–6, which also echoes 1 Sam 2:35 (see my discussion of 3:1–6 in chapter 7, above).

passage “through the heavens.” Rather, the verse contains an echo of 1 Sam 2:35 read from an eschatological perspective, and the perfect active participle describes the activity of Jesus in the present. He is the faithful priest of 1 Sam 2:35, whom God has raised up in the last days. He ministers before God in the heavenly temple. This text anticipates “the true tent” (ἡ σκῆνη ἡ ἀληθινή) of Heb 8:2, pitched by the Lord. This is where God and his people will dwell together in the eschaton, where Jesus is now exalted and where he now “ministers,” that is, represents the believers before God.

Two hortatory subjunctives follow in Heb 4:15–16. The first flows from the claim that Jesus ministers in heaven—the readers are encouraged to hold fast to their confession (v. 15). The second emerges from the nature of the great high priest representing believers before God—he is able to sympathise with human weakness and has been tested as the believers are.³⁵ On this basis they are encouraged to “approach the throne of grace with confidence so as to receive mercy and find grace for their time of need” (προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεος καὶ χάριν εὐρωμεν εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν, 4:16).

The throne of grace is doubtless God’s throne from where God dispenses grace,³⁶ and where Jesus is seated at God’s right hand (8:1; 12:2).³⁷ The expression ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος is not found elsewhere in Judaism,³⁸ although occasionally in Rabbinic Judaism God is said to have two thrones, one of judgement and one of mercy.³⁹ In both the OT and the NT God is understood to be enthroned in heaven,⁴⁰ and also enthroned in the holy of holies in the tabernacle and temple, between the cherubim,⁴¹ on the so-called “mercy seat” (כפרת).⁴² This has led some scholars to suggest that the “throne of grace” is

35 I note in passing that the description of Jesus in Heb 4:15 is more appropriate as a description of a priest ministering in heaven than of a priest who has passed through the heavens.

36 Scholer 1991: 104; O’Brien 2010: 185.

37 For a heavenly throne see 1 En. 14:18; 45:3; Wis 9:4; 3 En. 10:1; Ezek. Trag. 68–69; Lad. Jac. 2:7; 4Q491c; 4Q405 20 II 21–22 2–5, 8; 11Q17 v 8. The throne of Jesus in Heb 1:8 is probably a metonym for his kingly rule.

38 Jewett 1981: 80.

39 Lev. Rab. 29:3–9. See also b. San. 38b.

40 1 Kings 22:19; Job 26:9; Ps 11:4; 103:19; Isa 6:1; 66:1; Ezek 1:26; 10:1; 4 Macc 17:18; Matt 5:34; 23:22; Acts 7:49; Rev 1:4; 3:21; 4:2–10; 5:1–13; 6:16; 7:9–17; 12:5; 14:3; 19:4–5; 20:11; 21:3, 5.

41 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kings 19:15; 1 Chr 13:6; Ps 80:1; 99:1; Isa 37:16. See also Ezek 9:3; 10:1–20; 11:22.

42 Exod 25:18, 19, 20, 22; 37:7, 8, 9; Num 7:89.

the heavenly equivalent of the mercy seat in the wilderness tabernacle.⁴³ This should not be pressed, however, since the LXX consistently renders the “cover” (כפרת) of the Ark of the Covenant with ἱλαστήριον, rather than θρόνος.⁴⁴ In Heb 2:17 Jesus becomes a high priest “so as to make expiation for the sins of the people” (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ), and Day of Atonement imagery is exploited in Heb 9:1–10:18 along the same lines, but here people are to approach, not for the removal of sin, but to receive mercy and grace as needed.

More appropriate to the context is Isa 16:5, which announces the establishment of a throne in steadfast love (וְהוֹכֵן בְּחֶסֶד כִּסֵּא), an expression rendered in the LXX with καὶ διορθωθήσεται μετ’ ἐλέους θρόνος.⁴⁵ This throne is established in “the (restored) tent of David” (ἐν σκηνῇ Δαυιδ) and one will sit on it “with sincerity” (μετὰ ἀληθείας). And while a throne is normally in a palace, that this throne is in a tent, makes the identification of Jesus the Son of God as the great high priest more appropriate in the context. This is the throne of grace on which Jesus is enthroned in response to the command of Ps 110:1 in the last days (Heb 1:1–2).⁴⁶

The readers are encouraged to “approach” (προσερχομαι) this throne of grace. Προσερχομαι appears eighty-six times in the NT, where it is the usual word for the approach of one person to another or to some object or location. The word appears seven times in Hebrews and in four of these it refers to people

43 Michel 1975: 209–10; Hagner 1983: 60; Attridge 1989: 142; Bruce 1990: 116–17; Grässer 1990–97: 1: 258; Koester 2001: 284; Eskola 2001: 252–53; Mackie 2007: 166; O’Brien 2010: 185–86; Barnard 2012: 185. Against this see Ellingworth 1993: 270.

44 In the Hebrew bible כפרת is always the cover of the Ark of the Covenant (Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 26:34; 30:6; 31:7; 35:12; 37:6, 7, 8, 9; 39:35; 40:20; Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15; Num 7:89; 1 Chr 28:11), but its derivation from כפר (piel, “to atone,” see HALOT 493–94) indicates that it was understood as the place of atonement (Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15). In the LXX it is almost always rendered with ἱλαστήριον, see Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 31:7; 35:12; 37:6 (LXX 38:5–6); 37:7 (LXX 38:7); 37:8 (LXX 38:8); Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15; Num 7:89. In 1 Chr 28:11 the Greek equivalent is ἐξιλασμός. Thus ἱλαστήριον refers to the place of expiation or propitiation, rather than to a throne or a seat *per se*. Delitzsch 1868: 222 notes the derivation of the term “mercy-seat” from Luther’s *Gnadenstuhl*, as do BDAG 474; HALOT 495.

45 Moffatt 1924: 60; Braun 1984: 128. The LXX of Hos 6:6 renders כסד with ἔλεος and this appears in the two quotations of that text in the NT (Matt 9:13; 12:7). Elsewhere in the NT where ἔλεος appears, OT ideas associated with כסד are often present. See, e.g. Matt 23:23; Luke 1:50, 54, 58, 72, 78; 10:37; Rom 9:23; 11:31; 15:9; Eph 2:4; Tit 3:5; Jas 3:17; 1 Pet 1:3. I am indebted to my student Karen Nelson for this insight.

46 For messianic and cultic associations related to the throne in the tent of Isa 16:5 see Wildberger 1997: 143–44.

approaching God.⁴⁷ In Heb 12:18, 22 the readers are said to have approached not Sinai, but Zion, and in the present verse they approach the throne of grace.

Hebrews is unique in the NT in using the word in cultic contexts, reflecting a minor usage of the word in the LXX,⁴⁸ where either priests or people approach God in the wilderness tabernacle or in one case in Ezekiel's ideal temple.⁴⁹ The word is not used for the entry of priests into the tabernacle proper,⁵⁰ or of the entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement.⁵¹ Thus, in the LXX the priests or the people approach the altar to worship, but when they enter the tabernacle or the holy of holies another verb is used.

Several scholars, noting cultic imagery in this pericope, have concluded that in this verse the readers are encouraged to enter the holy of holies in the heavenly temple.⁵² However, while later in Hebrews Jesus is said to do this, and while in 10:19 the people are encouraged to do the same, that is not the focus of this verse. Indeed, if this verse were to refer to the entry of the people into the holy of holies, surely another verb such as εἰσερχομαι would be used.⁵³

47 Heb 7:25; 10:1, 22; 11:6.

48 Of the eighty-six NT occurrences it only has cultic connotations in Hebrews. It appears 112 times in the LXX, and only with cultic connotations in Exod 12:48; 16:9; Lev 9:5, 7, 8; Ezek 44:16; 1 Macc 2:23. In Heb 11:6 the word seems to be used in a general non-cultic sense (Peterson 1982: 78–79, 230–31 [note 34]; Mackie 2008: 204), although Delitzsch 1868: 2: 230; Käsemann 1984: 54; Scholer 1991: 133–37 read it in cultic sense.

49 For the approach of the people see Exod 16:9; 34:32; Lev 9:5; 18:22, and for the approach of the priests see Lev 9:7, 8; 21:17, 18, 21, 23; 22:3; Num 17:5; Ezek 44:16. In Num 18:3 the Levites serve in the temple, but must not approach the utensils of the sanctuary or the altar. The word usually translates either קָרַב or נָגַשׁ but numerous other Greek words render these two words as well. See the discussion of προσέρχομαι in the LXX in Peterson 1982: 230 (note 33), and in Scholer 1991: 90–95, 150–53, who notes that it is limited to the approach to the environs of the wilderness tabernacle rather than the holy of holies.

50 See Exod 28:43 where entry to the tent of meeting is expressed with εἰσπορεύομαι and approach to the altar of burnt offering (in the outer court of the tabernacle) with προσπορεύομαι.

51 In Lev 16:2, 17, 23 the verb is εἰσπορεύομαι.

52 Lane 1991a: 115; Scholer 1991: 91–95. On p. 107 Scholer claims that Jesus “the ‘great high priest’ has entered into the heavenly holy of holies (4:14), and... now the readers are encouraged to... enter into the same holy of holies” (p. 107).

53 Εἰσερχομαι appears seventeen times in Hebrews. Scholer 1991: 182 concludes that “προσέρχεσθαι and εἰσερχεσθαι are synonymous cultic terms which are used interchangeably in Heb. as the object necessitates.” Εἰσερχομαι is used for the entry into God's rest in Heb 3–4, which I have argued is in the heavenly eschatological temple; for entry into the heavenly sanctuary in Heb 6:19–20; 9:12, 24, 25; and for Christ's entry into the κόσμος in Heb 10:5. Προσέρχομαι is used for the approach of people to God (7:25; 10:1, 22;

In v. 16 the readers are encouraged to approach God's throne seeking mercy and grace, which they receive in response to their prayers.⁵⁴ The language of approach does not envisage any physical motion towards the heavenly temple or any heavenly journey on the part of the people,⁵⁵ rather, it indicates that the heavenly temple encompasses both heaven and earth.⁵⁶ God's space, where Jesus is enthroned, intersects with human space at the point where God's people approach God in prayer,⁵⁷ not just in the Jerusalem temple. The place of the temple and its priesthood in the approach to God has been supplanted by Jesus and his heavenly ministry.

A Great Priest over the House of God (10:19–25)

The conjunction οὖν (“so then”) in 10:19 indicates that this pericope flows from what precedes, and the causal particle γάρ (“for”) in 10:26 shows that what follows explains it in some way. The exhortations in this pericope are tied to the existence of a great (high) priest for the community, and are supported by a variety of motive clauses. It is these motive clauses that I am mainly concerned with. The first exhortation (v. 22) and its motive clauses (vv. 19–21) contain considerable temple symbolism. The exhortation is to “approach” (προσερχομαι)⁵⁸

11:6); approach to the throne of grace (4:16); and the approach to Sinai and the heavenly Jerusalem respectively in 12:18, 22. Only in 4:16; 12:18, 22 might προσέρχομαι have a similar force to εἰσερχομαι. This does not seem to be the case in 12:18, as it is difficult to understand how the people could “enter” Sinai, and the use of the same word in 12:22 is for stylistic reasons in the finely balanced pericopes 12:18–21 and 12:22–24. This leaves only 4:16, under discussion here.

54 Rissi 1987: 97.

55 Contra Attridge 1989: 141 who suggests that the addressees are “urged to follow the path ‘through the heavens’ that Christ blazed and take advantage of the access to God that he provides.” He also suggests that approaching God in this verse is “a more encompassing image for entering into a covenantal relationship with God.” Barnard 2012: 184–87 treats Heb 4:14–16 in terms of merkavah mysticism. He cites the usual Jewish apocalyptic texts (see his note 66, p. 187), but Hebrews seems quite uninterested in the sorts of heavenly journeys that these texts envisage.

56 A similar understanding of God's space and human space is apparent in the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the community has access to the heavenly temple while in the Judean desert. See footnote 174 to Chapter 7 (above).

57 In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8; 2 Chr 6) he asks that when people pray in the temple God will hear in heaven. The distinction in Hebrews is not so much that his people have access to the presence of God in heaven, but that it is available without an earthly priesthood and temple.

58 The original hand of P⁴⁶ appears to read the indicative προσερχόμεθα followed by γάρ, rather than the subjunctive. The indicative also appears in D, K, L, P and several

God, again with the implication that God's dwelling place is not restricted to some location "up in heaven" which the earthbound community would need to undertake a heavenly journey to access;⁵⁹ rather, since the community on earth has this access in the present, God's space, while distinct from human space, intersects with human space.⁶⁰

Hebrews 10:19 begins with the present participle of ἔχω ("to have"), expressing a causal relationship with the other verbs in the sentence. While impersonal, it should be rendered "since we have" in line with the first person plural verbs in the sentence. This sentence makes two claims upon which the exhortations that follow are based. The first claim is that "we" have "confidence" (παρρησία) "with respect to the entrance to the sanctuary" (εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν τῶν ἁγίων), and the second claim is that "we" have a great priest over the house of God.

In line with the customary usage in Hebrews, the definite, neuter plural of ἅγιος (v. 19) should be read as a reference to the heavenly temple, pictured as a holy of holies where God dwells,⁶¹ but no consensus has been reached on the precise sense of the expression εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν τῶν ἁγίων. The Greek word εἰσοδος, like the English word "entrance," has two senses, a verbal sense ("the act of entering") and a local sense ("a place of entry").⁶² While it is not always clear which sense is being used in either the LXX or the NT, in some texts when it is followed by a genitive personal pronoun it refers to the act of entering,⁶³ and when followed by a genitive of place it refers to a place of

minuscules. The subjunctive appears in P¹³, the corrector of P⁴⁶, **8**, A, C, **Ψ**, some minuscules and the Majority Text. Its superior attestation, the parallel with 4:16 and the other subjunctives in 10:19–25 indicate that this is almost certainly the original reading.

59 While the location of the approach is unstated, the use of προσέρχομαι in Hebrews for the approach to God (7:25; 10:1; 11:6), or to the dwelling place of God (4:16; 12:18, 22), indicates that this is in view, as does the concentration of temple imagery in the pericope.

60 Kline 1996 (n.p.) notes that "[r]eference to the invisible realm as 'above' is simply a spatial figure based on a natural analogy between what is physically higher and what is more exalted in dignity and honor." See also Wright 2007b: 120–22.

61 Heb 8:2; 9:8, 12, 25; 13:11. See Mackie 2007: 125, note 324.

62 BDAG 294–95 also lists a third sense "acceptance" or "welcome" (1 Thess 1:9). The word appears only here in Hebrews and four times elsewhere in the NT. Apart from 1 Thess 1:9, the NRSV reads the other four occurrences, including Heb 10:19, in the verbal sense, as an act of entering (Acts 13:24; 1 Thess 2:1; 2 Pet 1:11).

63 Judg 1:14; 1 Kgdms 16:14; 29:6; 2 Kgdms 3:25; 3 Kgdms 2:13; 3:7; 4 Kgdms 19:27; Ps 120:8 (LXX); Isa 37:28; Jer 8:7; Mal 3:2; Pss Sol 4:14; Acts 13:24; 1 Thess 2:1; Philo, *Deus* 132; *Ebr.* 9. Other syntactical constructions occur, e.g. in 2 Pet 1:11, although it seems clear that that text refers to the entry of the readers into (εἰς) the eternal kingdom (verbal sense).

entry.⁶⁴ In Heb 10:19 εἴσοδος is followed by a genitive of place (τῶν ἁγίων), suggesting the expression here refers to the entrance to the sanctuary,⁶⁵ and the preposition εἰς has the sense “with reference to.”⁶⁶ This is confirmed by the following claim that the “entrance” (εἴσοδος) has been “consecrated” (ἐγκαινίζω)⁶⁷ as “a new and living way” (ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζώσαν) “through the curtain” (διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος).⁶⁸

While it is not difficult to understand the sense of “have confidence to enter the sanctuary,” it is not so clear what it means to have confidence “with respect to the entrance to the sanctuary.” However, when read with reference to Heb 9:7–10, where the high priest enters only annually, and “not without blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος), clarity begins to emerge. Under the new order all has changed: approach to the presence of God is not limited to the high priest, and the restrictions around the approach of the OT priesthood have been lifted, so that all who are cleansed can confidently approach God. Under the old order the “entrance” (εἴσοδος) to the holy of holies was restricted to the high priest; now all may pass through it.

While the text refers to the “curtain” (καταπέτασμα) separating the holy of holies from the outer court of the wilderness tabernacle, I will argue in later in this chapter that the heavenly temple is not a bicameral sanctuary. Rather, this curtain symbolises the access to God now available through Christ. This is clear from its apparent identification with the flesh of Christ in the clause τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (“this is his flesh”).⁶⁹ This expression has long been

64 Judg 1:24, 25; 4 Kgdms 11:16; 23:11; 2 Chr 26:8; Ezek 27:3; 44:5; Josephus *Ant.* 19.332.

65 Contra Mackie 2007: 203, following Michaelis 1967: 75–78.

66 For this sense of εἰς see BDAG 291 and Attridge 1989: 284 (note 15). εἰς has this sense in Heb 6:10; 7:14; 9:9; 12:3. If εἴσοδος is read as the act of entry, as numerous scholars maintain (including Moffatt 1924: 142; Spicq 1952: 2: 315; Bruce 1990: 250; Johnson 2006; Thompson 2008: 202), the preposition εἰς expresses purpose or result.

67 BDAG 272 suggests that ἐγκαινίζω has the sense of “open” in Heb 10:20. The word appears only twice in the NT, here and in Heb 9:18 referring to the inauguration of the first covenant with blood. It appears fifteen times in the LXX, in a variety of contexts, but in cultic contexts it always has the sense of “consecrate” or “(re)dedicate” (3 Kgdms 8:63; 2 Chr 7:5; 15:8; 1 Macc 4:36, 54, 57; 5:1) and this sense should be read here. The antecedent of ἐγκαινίζω is not ὁδός (“way”), but εἴσοδος (“entrance”). The entrance has been consecrated for us as a “new and living way.” In this sentence, then, ἐγκαινίζω takes a double accusative, and ὁδός is “in independent juxtaposition with εἴσοδος as a predicative acc[usative]” (Michaelis 1967: 76).

68 Those who read the text in this way include Peterson 1982: 270 (note 170); Attridge 1989: 284; Koester 2001: 442; O'Brien 2010: 365.

69 Buchanan 1972: 168 deletes the expression τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as a gloss that has made its way into the text, a suggestion that Héring 1970: 91 mentions, but seems not to

the subject of debate, bristling as it is with both syntactical and hermeneutical difficulties.

In terms of syntax, the antecedent of the demonstrative clause τοῦτ' ἔστιν ("this is") could be either: (1) the new and living way; (2) the curtain; or (3) the entire clause beginning with ἐγκαινίζω. If the antecedent is the new and living way (1), the phrase is a dependent genitive, with the sense that the new and living way through the curtain is "the way of his flesh," perhaps the way that Christ entered into the holy of holies or some similar construction.⁷⁰ If the antecedent is the curtain (2), the phrase is to be understood as appositional, identifying the flesh of Christ with the curtain, and with the preposition "through" governing both καταπέτασμα and the σάρξ ("flesh") to give the sense of "a new and living way through the curtain, that is through his flesh."⁷¹ If the antecedent is the entire clause (3), the τοῦτ' ἔστιν clause is again appositional, although here another διὰ needs to be supplied, so that the phrase is read as "he has inaugurated a new and living way through the curtain, that is, [through, sc. by means of] his flesh." Here the preposition διὰ is to be construed locally with καταπέτασμα ("a way through the curtain"), and the supplied preposition construed instrumentally with σάρξ ("by means of his flesh").⁷²

Since the expression τοῦτ' ἔστιν is appositional in the other five occurrences in Hebrews,⁷³ there is good reason for reading the expression in 10:20 in the same way.⁷⁴ This makes it unlikely (although not impossible) that the genitive

prefer, and Hofius 1970a: 133 discounts. Käsemann 1984: 224–27 reads this pericope with reference to gnostic speculation. Details of such speculation are given in Wilson 1987: 188–89, who argues that these parallels show how the image could be developed along such lines, but do not explain its source.

70 Westcott 1892: 320–21; Spicq 1952: 2: 316; Cody 1960: 161; Andriessen and Lenglet 1970: 214–15; DeSilva 2000b: 335.

71 Young 1973: 103–4; Peterson 1982: 153–54; Attridge 1989: 286; Bruce 1990: 252–53; Guthrie 1998: 342–43; Mitchell 2007: 211; Thompson 2008: 203; O'Brien 2010: 364–65. I leave aside for the moment whether διὰ has a local or an instrumental sense or both.

72 Moffatt 1924: 143; Hofius 1970a: 156–58; Jeremias 1971: 131; Lane 1991b: 275–76; Koester 2001: 443–44 argue for this reading, while Rissi 1987: 42 thinks it unlikely. For similar constructions see Rom 9:7–8; 10:7. Johnsson 1973: 353–55 argues for this reading, but then offers the translation "a new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain—that is, the way of his flesh . . ."

73 Heb 2:14; Heb 7:5; 9:11; 11:16; 13:15. While τοῦτ' ἔστιν does not always relate to the immediately preceding word (as Andriessen and Lenglet 1970: 214–15 point out), the following word is always in the same case and in apposition to the antecedent.

74 Young 1973: 103; Attridge 1989: 286.

τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is to be read as “(the way of) his flesh”⁷⁵ (reading 1) and the answer is to be sought in one of the other two readings.

The referent of the flesh of Jesus (σάρξ) is also debated. It could be understood either as his incarnation (as in 2:17),⁷⁶ or his death (corresponding to the reference to his blood in v. 19, a metaphor for his death), and the curtain (καταπέτασμα) could be understood either as a barrier to the presence of God or a means of access to the presence of God.⁷⁷

While the precise sense may be elusive, the temple imagery is clear. Based on other instances of τοῦτ’ ἔστιν in Hebrews, I favour an appositional reading, making it likely that the curtain is to be identified with the flesh of Jesus and is governed by the preposition in the expression διὰ τοῦ καταπέτασματος, with the sense “through the curtain, that is (through) his flesh.” This applies whether the expression τοῦτ’ ἔστιν relates back to the curtain or to the entire clause. It is also likely that whichever of these two options is adopted (and both have their merits), the preposition in the text is to be understood locally (a new and living way through the curtain), with the sense of the supplied preposition gliding to

75 Moreover, one would expect to read τοῦτ’ ἔστιν τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ if the genitive was dependent upon ὁδός, since this word is a long way from τῆς σαρκὸς. It is also unlikely that the expression is to be read as “through the veil, that is, the veil of his flesh,” a suggestion made and dismissed on these grounds by Westcott 1892: 319–20; Young 1973: 103; Lane 1991b: 275; Lindars 1991: 103; and Koester 2001: 443, but adopted by Johnson 2006: 257.

76 Hughes 1977: 409; Hofius 1970a: 132–41.

77 Young 1973: 100 (note 4). Delitzsch 1868: 2: 172–73 proposes an allusion to the torn veil of the Synoptic tradition, with the notion of the (torn) veil a “daring poetical touch” (Moffatt 1924: 143) with the flesh of Christ torn before his blood could be shed, enabling access to the presence of God. Hughes 1977: 409 thinks that if the flesh of Christ refers to “the incarnation, seen in the light of the fulfilment of its purpose in the offering of the perfect and final sacrifice on the cross,” there is no need to postulate two different senses for the preposition διὰ. On this reading both the torn flesh of Christ and the torn veil indicate that the way to the presence of God is now open. Attridge 1989: 286–87 and Lindars 1991: 102–3 find such an allusion unwarranted. All this is unnecessary. The veil, as in 6:19; 9:2 is simply the point of entry to the presence of God, and the imagery is from the Day of Atonement rather than from the tearing of the veil when Jesus died. On the other hand, Barnard 2012: 196–202 argues that the text indicates that the recipients of Hebrews underwent ritual immersions as preparation for their (mystical) entry to the heavenly sanctuary. It seems more likely that this reference is polemic against any such ongoing practice. Since the death of Jesus (10:19) had provided the inward and outward cleansing required for an approach to God, any ongoing external ritual was now unnecessary. The text implies the same polemic as I discuss in my treatment of 13:10–16 in chapter 7 (above).

an instrumental sense.⁷⁸ The expression “[through] his flesh” is parallel to “by means of his blood” in v. 19, and the flesh and the blood both refer to the death of Christ.⁷⁹ The curtain in the wilderness tabernacle was the barrier concealing the way into the earthly holy of holies (Heb 9:6–10), and the death of Christ has inaugurated a new and living way into the heavenly temple for his followers.⁸⁰

Verse 22 contains two clauses beginning with perfect participles, describing the hearts of the recipients as “sprinkled from an evil conscience” (ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς), and their bodies as “washed with pure water” (καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ). The word ῥαντίζω appears four times in the NT, all in Hebrews,⁸¹ and three times in the OT, none of which are in strictly cultic contexts.⁸² Psalm 51:7 (LXX 50:9), however, contains similar imagery to Heb 10:22 when the psalmist claims that if God were to “sprinkle” (ῥαντίζω) him with hyssop and “wash” (πλύνω) him, then he would be clean. Cultic metaphors are adopted to refer to inner cleansing by God.⁸³ The word λούω appears five times in the NT, only one of which is in Hebrews, and

-
- 78 Hofius 1970a: 132–41; O’Brien 2010: 364–65; Moffitt 2011: 281–83; Barnard 2012: 195 (note 97). Later in this chapter I argue that in 9:11–12, where the preposition διὰ appears three times governed by the same verb, construing it with two different senses is difficult, but not impossible. There, I argue for an instrumental sense in all three instances. Here, I am arguing that an explicit διὰ (διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος) is to be read locally, and an implicit διὰ ([διὰ] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ) governing the same verb is to be read instrumentally.
- 79 Young 1973: 104; Ellingworth 1993: 520–21; Koester 2001: 443–44; Mitchell 2007: 211; Thompson 2008: 203; O’Brien 2010: 364–65; Barnard 2012: 195.
- 80 Moffitt 2011: 281–83, following Hofius 1970a: 132–41 refers to the veil of the heavenly temple through which Jesus passed into the presence of God. But in this text Jesus is not the subject of any verb of motion. By his death he inaugurates the entrance to the sanctuary as a new and living way for his followers into the presence of God. It is they who enter in this pericope, not Jesus.
- 81 Heb 9:13, 19, 21; 10:22. It also appears in textual variants in Mark 7:4; Rev 19:13—in both places as a substitute for βαπτίζω.
- 82 In Lev 6:20; 4 Kgdms 9:33 it refers to blood spattering.
- 83 A similar verb ῥαίνω (“to sprinkle”) appears thirteen times in the OT, mostly in cultic contexts. See Exod 29:21; Lev 4:17; 5:9; 8:11; 14:16, 27; 16:14, 15, 19; Num 19:4; Isa 45:8; Ezek 36:25. In Isa 45:8 the word refers to the skies raining righteousness, and Ezek 36:25 is similar to the use of ῥαντίζω in Ps 50:9 (LXX), where God explains that he will sprinkle clean water on the people and they will be clean.

elsewhere there are no cultic connotations.⁸⁴ However, there are distinct cultic connotations in the LXX.⁸⁵

The imagery behind ῥαντίζω is to be understood in terms of its use in Heb 9:13, 19–21 and, in particular, 9:13 where the text compares the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer that purifies the flesh with the blood of Christ that cleanses the conscience.⁸⁶ Aside from this, the cultic connotations of both λούω and ῥαίνω where they appear in the LXX in connection with the consecration of the priesthood, as well as the frequent use of λούω for ritual cleansing from defilement, are significant background. The author is using familiar cultic terminology to refer to inward (heart) and outward (body), and therefore comprehensive, cleansing to support the exhortation to approach the presence of God.⁸⁷ The text is similar to Ps 50:9 (LXX); Isa 1:16; Ezek 36:25–26, where cultic terminology is applied figuratively to refer to purification from defilement.⁸⁸

The concentration of cultic imagery in this pericope finds its counterpart in earlier chapters of Hebrews. The “curtain” (καταπέτασμα) appears in 6:19 as the place hope enters, and where Jesus the forerunner has gone, and in 9:3 to separate the holy place from the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle. The “new” (πρόσφατος) and “living” (ζάω) way of 10:19 that has been “consecrated” (ἐγκαινίζω) contrasts with the former way, also consecrated (9:18), but now “grown old” (γηράσκω) and near to “destruction” (ἀφανισμός, 8:13).⁸⁹ The sprinkling of 9:13 could only cleanse externals, while the sprinkling and washing of 10:22 effect internal and external purification.

This pericope deals with the “free access” (παρρησία) that the believers have to the presence of God through the death of Jesus. Here, temple symbolism is pressed into service to describe the access to God now available to God’s new covenant people. Jesus is enthroned in the heights in the world to come in the present (1:1–3, 6), and his followers, who must strive to enter God’s rest in the heavenly temple in the future (4:11), now have access to it in the present,

84 John 13:10; Acts 9:37; 16:33; 2 Pet 2:22.

85 For λούω in connection with the priesthood see Exod 29:4; 40:12; Lev 8:6; 16:4, 24, 26, 28; Num 19:7, 8, 19; and in connection with the cleansing of defiled people, see Lev 11:40; 14:8, 9; 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27; 17:15, 16; 22:6; Deut 23:12.

86 Heb 9:19, 21 are allusions to the inauguration of the Sinai covenant in Exod 24:3–8; and the consecration of the priests in Lev 8:15–19, although the words ῥαίνω or ῥαντίζω appear in neither of these texts.

87 Barnard 2012: 195–96.

88 Calvin 1996: 208; Rissi 1987: 99–100; Bruce 1990: 255–56; Attridge 1989: 289; Scholer 1991: 13; Lane 1991b: 287; Thompson 2008: 204; O’Brien 2010: 368.

89 Walker 1994: 63.

while still on earth. Both present and future, and above and below are merged into a single present reality, with temple symbolism the mechanism used to express this.

A Stable and Reliable Hope (6:18–20)

The central section of Hebrews can be divided into two parts. Hebrews 5:1–7:26 deals with the appointment of the Son of God as a superior high priest, and 8:1–10:18 deal with the self-offering of this high priest.⁹⁰ Hebrews 5:1–10 establishes his appointment as a high priest from Ps 110:4 where the Israelite king is addressed as “a priest forever just like Melchizedek” (ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ),⁹¹ a text quoted in Heb 5:6 alongside Ps 2:7, earlier applied to the exalted Son of God (Heb 1:5). Hebrews 5:7–10 is one long sentence relating the process by which Jesus became such a priest, and concluding with an allusion to Ps 110:4 that claims that Jesus was “designated by God a priest just like Melchizedek” (προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ).

According to Heb 5:11 the readers were too dull to understand what the author had to say about Melchizedek’s priesthood.⁹² Consequently, he turns in 5:11–6:20 to warn them about the dangers of falling away (5:11–6:12). This warning concludes with a call for them to imitate those “who through faith and patience inherit the promises” (6:12). Verses 13–15 give the example of Abraham as one who patiently endured and obtained what God promised him following the *Aqedah* (Gen 22:16–17, cited in Heb 6:13–14), and the example of Abraham leads into a discussion of a promise of God, guaranteed by an oath

90 Guthrie 1994: 106–8, 144 (figure 35). On p. 82 Guthrie demonstrates how Heb 5:1–3 and 7:27–28 form an inclusio around this section.

91 For the translation of κατὰ τὴν τάξιν with “just like” see Longenecker 1978: 174; BDAG 989, s.v. τάξις, 4. NRSV translates Ps 110:4 (עַל דְּבַרְתִּי מַלְכִּי צִדֵּךְ) with “according to the order of Melchizedek,” a translation it retains wherever the expression appears in Hebrews (5:6, 10; 6:20, 7:11, 17). But one point of the Melchizedek argument of Hebrews is that unlike Aaron, Melchizedek was not the first of an “order” of priests. In an allusion to Ps 110:4 in Heb 7:15, the author replaces the words κατὰ τὴν τάξιν with κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητά (“according to the likeness”) of Melchizedek.

92 Longenecker (ibid.: 174) suggests that relative pronoun in the expression περὶ οὗ (“concerning which”) is masculine and that the antecedent is Melchizedek. While grammatically possible, this is unlikely since the text says much more about priesthood like Melchizedek than about Melchizedek himself.

(v. 16). These two unchangeable things (the promise and the oath)⁹³ are intended to encourage the readers to “hold on” (κρατέω) to the hope that lies ahead (vv. 17–18). Verse 19 explains why this hope is so sure, and in v. 20 the warning and encouragement section concludes with the claim that Jesus has become a priest just like Melchizedek, a claim that will be substantiated in Heb 7:1–28.

In v. 19 “the hope laid before the readers” (τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος) is likened to an “anchor for life” (ἄγκυραν . . . τῆς ψυχῆς).⁹⁴ This hope is “stable and reliable, reaching into the curtain” (ἀσφαλὴ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος)⁹⁵ where “Jesus a forerunner has entered on ‘our’ behalf” (ἔπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς).⁹⁶

In the NT ἐλπίς (“hope”) has three senses:⁹⁷ an expectant attitude,⁹⁸ the basis or foundation of hope,⁹⁹ or that for which a person hopes.¹⁰⁰ The noun appears

93 Bruce 1990: 154. The precise promise and oath are not specified, perhaps because the author had more than one text in mind. Gen 22:16–17, cited in Heb 6:13–14, is in the immediate context, and the allusion to Ps 110:4 in 6:20 would bring with it the first part that verse (“YHWH has sworn and will not change his mind,” LXX ὥμοσεν κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμελήσεται), cited and interpreted in Heb 7:20–21, 28. Young 2001: 170–71 and Johnson 2006: 171 suggest that Heb 6:19–20 links these two texts together. Attridge 1989: 181–82 suggests the promise and oath contained in Pss 2:7 and 110:4.

94 For the translation “anchor for life” see Lane 1991a: 147.

95 For the translation of the present participle εἰσερχομένην with “reaching into” see BDAG 294, s.v. εἰσέρχομαι, 3, and Hofius 1972: 87, who suggests that εἰσέρχομαι has a “static” sense here and a dynamic sense in v. 20. This feminine singular participle could refer either to the “hope” (ἐλπίς) or to the “anchor” (ἄγκυρα). Delitzsch 1868: 1: 319; Simpson 1946: 187; Käsemann 1984: 227; Attridge 1989: 183–84; Mayer 1990: 440; Scholer 1991: 181; Johnson 2006: 172–73 envisage the anchor (sometimes identified as Jesus himself) entering the sanctuary, but it is better to read the words ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς (“which we have as an anchor for life”), and ἀσφαλὴ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (“both stable and reliable, and reaching within the curtain”) as two statements qualifying ἡ ἐλπίς, with the hope reaching within the curtain rather than the anchor. See the discussions in Ellingworth 1993: 345; Lane 1991a: 153–54; O’Brien 2010: 241 (note 187). Hofius 1972: 87 (note 226) suggests that the conjunction καὶ in the expression καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος is exegetical, giving the participle a causal nuance: the hope is stable and reliable *because* it reaches within the curtain. This is a valuable insight.

96 I enclose “our” in quote marks to indicate a reference to the author and recipients of Hebrews, rather than to later readers.

97 For the following analysis see BDAG 319–20.

98 E.g. Acts 16:19; 27:20; 1 Cor 9:10; 2 Cor 1:7. Christian expectation (hope) is confidence in God, as in e.g. Rom 5:4–5; 12:12; 15:13.

99 E.g. Col 1:27; 1 Thess 2:19; 1 Tim 1:1.

100 E.g. Rom 8:24; Col 1:5; Tit 2:13.

five times in Hebrews¹⁰¹ and the verb ἐλπίζω (“to hope”) once (11:1) where it is a substantival present participle, referring to “things hoped for” (corresponding to the third sense in which the noun is used). The adjectival present participle προκειμένης (“lying ahead”)¹⁰² in Heb 6:18 indicates that here ἐλπίς refers to the object of hope,¹⁰³ which extends within the curtain. ἐλπίς probably carries this sense in the other instances where it is definite in Hebrews, usually referring to the eschatological goal of the people of God,¹⁰⁴ God’s rest in the eschatological temple of Heb 4:1–11.¹⁰⁵

This hope extends (εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) where Jesus has already entered as a forerunner. The expression “within the curtain” occurs four times in the LXX to refer to the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle.¹⁰⁶ Here, it is a periphrasis for the heavenly temple as the holy of holies.¹⁰⁷

The preponderance of figurative language in these verses is significant. The readers are depicted as “refugees” (οἱ καταφυγόντες), hope is “like an anchor” (ὡς ἄγκυραν), and Jesus is a “forerunner” (πρόδρομος), an athletic image.¹⁰⁸ If the object of hope extends within the curtain, it raises the question as to whether the expression εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (“within the curtain”) should also be taken figuratively, rather than imagining an actual

101 Heb 3:6; 6:11, 18; 7:19; 10:23.

102 Πρόκειμαι appears five times in the NT, three of which are in Hebrews, always a present participle, acting as an adjective. In Heb 12:1 the readers are encouraged to run the race set before them, and in Heb 12:2 Jesus endures the cross because of the joy set before him. Here, the readers are to seize the hope that lies ahead (unlike 12:1, 2 there is no qualifying pronoun in 6:18).

103 Moffatt 1924: 88; Bultmann and Rengstorf 1964: 530 (note 100); Attridge 1989: 183; Lane 1991a: 153 (who argues that in Hebrews hope “never” describes a subjective attitude). Rissi 1987: 97 argues for the subjective sense in this verse, and Westcott 1892: 162 and Koester 2001: 329 suggest that neither the objective nor the subjective sense can be excluded.

104 Ellingworth 1993: 212, 332, 344, 382, 525. In 3:6 ἐλπίς qualifies confidence and pride (ἡ παρησία καὶ τὸ καύχημα) in what is hoped for; in 6:11 the hope is the promise of 6:12, which they will inherit if they hold on to their hope; and in 10:23 it is again the hope of entering God’s rest in the eschaton. In 7:19 where it is anarthrous it refers to “a better hope” by which we can approach God, that is, the better covenant of 7:22.

105 O’Brien 2010: 243.

106 Exod 26:33; Lev 16:2, 12, 15, see also Heb 9:3.

107 Hofius 1972: 88; Schenck 2007: 175.

108 Πρόδρομος also appears in military and naval contexts. For the details see Bauernfeind 1972: 235; Ellingworth 1993: 348; Koester 2001: 330; O’Brien 2010: 242 (note 194). Like ἀρχηγός (“pioneer”), πρόδρομος refers to the first in a series that will follow afterwards, the “precursor” of the believers. See Bruce 1990: 155; Scholer 1991: 177; O’Brien 2010: 242.

curtain in the heavenly temple enclosing an inner compartment where God is enthroned.¹⁰⁹ As I have argued, elsewhere in Hebrews heavenly temple imagery refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. That such a temple should have a veil separating God from the people is an odd idea.¹¹⁰ Rather, the expression is likely to be a figurative reference to the presence of God,¹¹¹ where Jesus is now exalted.¹¹²

Jesus Exalted Higher than the Heavens (7:26–28)

It would be a diversion to work through Heb 7:1–25 which clarifies the implications of Jesus being a priest like Melchizedek. However, the concluding

109 The veil of the *debir* appears twice in the tenth song of the Sabbath Songs (4Q405 15 11–16 3, 5), in a context that seems to indicate that in the “temple” in these texts, however conceived, there is an inner shrine (or multiple inner shrines). See the discussion of the Sabbath Songs in chapter 3, above. Those who see a reference to a literal heavenly holy of holies in this text include Hofius 1972: 50–55, 84–94; Rice 1987: 65–71 (although he argues that this text refers to more than the *debir*); Attridge 1989: 184–85 (tentatively); Bruce 1990: 155; Gane 2000: 5–8; DeSilva 2000b: 251 (note 98); Young 2001: 165–73; 2002b: 61–68; Davidson 2001: 175; 2002: 70; Gurtner 2005b: 344–53; Moffitt 2011: 224; Barnard 2012: 192–94.

110 Schenck 2007: 175–77.

111 Moffatt 1924: 89; Loader 1981: 182–84; Ellingworth 1986: 349; Koester 1989: 163–64; 2001: 330; Johnson 2006: 172–73. In Philo Her. 221–229; *QE* 2.68–69; *Spec.* 1.66; and Josephus *Ant.* 3.123, 181 the curtain separates the material world from the heavenly world. On this imagery in Philo and Josephus see Koester 1989: 59–63. Käsemann 1984: 299–300 sees the curtain as referring to the boundary between the earthly and heavenly worlds, with its background in gnostic traditions.

112 O'Brien 2010: 242 suggests that the notion of hope penetrating behind the curtain means that “believers *in hope* may now enter where Jesus has already gone in reality,” and Barnard 2012: 192–94 claims that “those who have fled for refuge are encouraged to seize the hope before them . . . and enter the sanctuary.” But the text does not say this. The object of hope (their eschatological goal) extends into the heavenly temple where Jesus is. He has entered as a forerunner, and they will enter if they hold on to their hope of entry. Similarly, Scholer 1991: 181 refers to the believers’ freedom to enter the holy of holies, and Johnson 2006: 173 suggests that the readers are to “follow after and ‘take hold of’ the hope . . . that is, enter themselves in to God’s presence.” This seems to stretch the imagery too far. Barnard 2012: 193 also claims that the present tenses in the verse (ἐρχομεν, εἰσερχομενην) indicate that “life in the heavenly realm” . . . [is] a present reality.” For the future orientation of these verses see Ellingworth 1993: 344—the hope is God’s rest of Heb 4:1–11, the city of 11:10; 13:14, and the country of 11:14, all in the world to come. They are to hold fast the hope of entering this in the eschaton.

summary with verbal links back to earlier parts of Hebrews and setting out the characteristics of the high priest like Melchizedek (7:26) warrants attention. In contrast to the former priests he has no need to offer multiple sacrifices, since his “once and for all” (ἐφάπαξ) self-offering finally dealt with sin (v. 27). It concludes with the claim that while the law appoints priests who are subject to weakness, the oath (of Ps 110:4) appoints a son (Ps 2:7) who has been made perfect forever (v. 28). Verse 26 sets out the characteristics of the high priest, v. 27 anticipates the treatment of his self-offering (to be covered in 8:1–10:18), and v. 28 functions as a conclusion to the treatment of his appointment as a high priest that began in 5:11.

The description of the high priest who is precisely appropriate (ἔπρεπεν) for “us,”¹¹³ comprises three adjectives (“holy, blameless, undefiled,” ὁσιος ἀκακος ἀμίαντος),¹¹⁴ an adjectival phrase with a perfect passive participle (“separated from sinners,” κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν) and a second adjectival phrase using an aorist participle and a comparative adjective (“having become higher than the heavens,” ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος). This last phrase expresses some relationship between Jesus and the heavens. The understanding of the sentence partly depends on the sense of the word καί (“and”) joining the last two expressions.

If “separated from sinners” is taken with what precedes (“holy, blameless undefiled”), it is a further declaration of the sinlessness of the high priest.¹¹⁵ The perfect passive participle acts as an adjective, and the καί joining this expression to what follows simply adds a further quality—he is “holy, blameless, undefiled, qualitatively different from sinners, and has become higher than the heavens.” On the other hand, if “separated from sinners” is construed with what follows (“exalted above the heavens”), it expresses the extent of his separation from sinners. His (physical) separation is to a realm “even” (καί) higher than the heavens.¹¹⁶

113 The καί that precedes ἔπρεπεν is emphatic, hence the translation “precisely,” which is from Lane 1991a: 176, note w).

114 See the discussion of the senses of these three words in Ellingworth 1993: 393–94 and O’Brien 2010: 279–80, who points out that they are near synonyms. Together they give some emphasis. Cockerill 2012: 338–39 translates “covenant keeping [pointing out that in the LXX ὁσιος is used to translate יָדִישׁ], without evil, without blemish.”

115 For this reading see Westcott 1892: 195; Buchanan 1972: 128; Héring 1970: 63; Hughes 1977: 273–74. In T. Levi 4:2 Levi is “separated” (διαίρέω) from “unrighteousness” (ἀδικία) so that he can serve God “as son, a servant and a minister in his presence.” In m. Yoma 1.1 the high priest remains away from his house for a week of priestly duties before the Day of Atonement, but this is preparation for his role rather than separation from sinners.

116 BDAG, 1095, s.v. χωρίζω, 2. c. notes that the verb here can include both senses; that is, spatial separation from sinners and also qualitative difference. Peterson 1982: 116; Bruce 1990:

Lane argues strongly for the latter sense,¹¹⁷ noting that especially when used with the preposition *ἀπό* (“from”), *χωρίζω* (“to separate”) has a local rather than a qualitative sense.¹¹⁸ Confirming this is the aorist participle *γενόμενος* (having become) at the end of the verse, which expresses some relationship to the previous clause. Thus, it seems likely that the separation of Jesus from sinners took place when he was exalted to the highest height, higher even than the heavens.¹¹⁹

It is clear that *ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος* expresses extreme exaltation,¹²⁰ but it is unclear whether “heaven” is the created heavens, so that Jesus has been exalted beyond these, or whether “heaven” is God’s space, with Jesus exalted to the uppermost heaven with God, a reading perhaps reflecting the idea of successive levels of heaven found in other texts,¹²¹ even though such speculation is absent from Hebrews.¹²² Given that the word is in the plural

176 (note 88); Koester 2001: 367; DeSilva 2000b: 274–75; Mitchell 2007: 155–56 are reluctant to exclude either sense.

117 Lane 1991a: 192. Lane’s translation (“having been separated from sinners, he became even higher than the heavens” p. 174) places the emphasis slightly differently. A better rendering that takes seriously the aorist participle at the end of the verse is “... separated from sinners, having become even higher than the heavens.”

118 For *χωρίζω* with *ἀπό* in the NT see Acts 1:4; 18:2; Rom 8:35, 39; 1 Cor 7:10, and for other constructions see Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9; Acts 18:1 (with *ἐκ*); 1 Cor 7:11, 15; Phlm 15. Nowhere else in the NT does it refer to a qualitative difference. It does have this sense in 3 Macc 2:25 (without *ἀπό*), but elsewhere it refers to physical separation, either from a location or from people (with *ἀπό* Judg 4:11; Prov 18:1; 1 Esd 7:13; 9:9; 2 Esd 9:1; Wis 1:3; 1 Macc 1:11; 2 Macc 5:21; without *ἀπό* Lev 13:46; Judg 6:18; 1 Chr 12:9; 1 Esd 8:54, 66; 2 Esd 6:21; Ezek 46:19; 2 Macc 10:19; 12:12; 3 Macc 5:50. In 1 Esd 5:39 it refers to people being excluded from serving as priests.

119 Delitzsch 1868: 2: 4–5; Moffatt 1924: 101; Montefiore 1964: 130; Hay 1973: 102; Braun 1984: 223; Wilson 1987: 130–31; Attridge 1989: 213; Johnson 2006: 195; O’Brien 2010: 280. See also Heb 9:28 where Jesus appears once to deal with sin, and will appear a second time “apart from sin” (*χωρίς ἁμαρτίας*) to save those who eagerly await him. In 4:15 he was tested in every respect as we are, “without sin” (*χωρίς ἁμαρτίας*). “Sinners” (*ἁμαρτωλοί*) only feature in Hebrews here and in 12:3 where Jesus endured hostility from sinners, a claim that immediately follows a reference to his exaltation to the right hand of God. In both cases, the word is definite and possibly refers to the hostile “sinners” who put him to death (Attridge 1989: 213). That he is separated from the sinners (and not from the righteous) implies that he remains accessible to his people (4:16).

120 Ὑψηλότερος (“higher”) is the comparative of *ὑψιλός*, the word used in Hebrews in 1:3 to describe the situation of the exalted Son *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* (“in the heights,” i.e. in heaven).

121 In T. Levi 3:4 God dwells “in the uppermost heaven of all” (*ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ πάντων*).

122 Ellingworth 1993: 394. Contra Isaacs 1992: 205–6 who sees such speculation behind Heb 7:26.

(τῶν οὐρανῶν) it is likely that the reference is to the dwelling place of God,¹²³ and refers to the exaltation of Jesus to the highest place possible.¹²⁴ The language is figurative and refers to the supreme exaltation of this high priest.¹²⁵

Jesus, Minister of the Sanctuary, the True Tent (8:1–13)

A second allusion to Ps 110:1 appears in Heb 8:1–2, verses that make a transition from 7:1–28 on the appointment of the high priest to 8:3–10:18, dealing with the ministry of the high priest. In what follows I deal with Heb 8:1–2 which refers to the ministry of the heavenly high priest before turning to Heb 8:4–5 which, I will argue, compare the Jerusalem temple with “the heavenly things” (τὰ ἐπουρανία).¹²⁶

The Context and Structure of Hebrews 8

Hebrews 7:26–28 concludes the treatment of Jesus as a priest like Melchizedek (Heb 4:14–7:28), and Heb 9:1–10:18 deals with the ministry of this priest. Hebrews 8 lies between these two sections and is made up of three parts: Heb 8:1–2 forms a transition from the treatment of Jesus as a priest like Melchizedek to the heavenly ministry of Jesus;¹²⁷ Heb 8:3–5a compares the priesthood of Jesus with that of the (high) priests in the Jerusalem temple and claims a

123 See my discussion of the sense of οὐρανός (“heaven”) in connection with Heb 4:14 earlier in this chapter.

124 Hofius 1972: 68–69; Lane 1991a: 192; Scholer 1991: 161; Bauckham 1999: 52–53; O’Brien 2010: 280–81. While the reference to the uppermost heaven in T. Levi 3:4 is in the context of a heavenly journey, in 1 En. 1:4 God comes “from the heaven of heavens” (ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν). There are no successive levels of heaven in 1 Enoch, and the expression “the heaven of heavens” is a figurative way of expressing the remoteness of God’s dwelling place from the earth. Heb 7:26 expresses a similar notion with respect to the exaltation of Christ.

125 Similar metaphors operate in Ps 113:5–6 where God’s glory is “above the heavens” (ἐπὶ τοῦς οὐρανοῦς), God “dwells in the heights” (ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν) and looks down “on the heavens and the earth” (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ).

126 I am aware that most scholars see a reference to the wilderness tabernacle in Heb 8:5. I argued briefly for a reference to the temple in my Introduction to Part Two (above). Here I fill out that discussion.

127 Guthrie 1994: 106–8 calls Heb 8:1–2 a “direct intermediary transition” in that it gathers up thoughts of the previous section (5:1–7:28) dealing with the appointment of Jesus as a high priest like Melchizedek, and prepares the way for the following section dealing with the ministry of the high priest in the heavenly sanctuary (8:3–10:18).

relationship between that temple and the eschatological temple which it anticipated; Heb 8:5b cites Exod 25:40 to support the claim of this relationship; and Heb 8:7–13 cites and briefly interprets Jer 31 (LXX 38):31–34.¹²⁸ This text is cited again in 10:17–18, forming an inclusio around the treatment of the ministry of Jesus and indicating the context in which it is to be understood.¹²⁹ Jeremiah anticipated a time when God would introduce a new means of relating to his people, and the author of Hebrews announces that this time has now come. Moreover, Jeremiah announced that one aspect of this new covenant is the forgiveness of sins, and the author of Hebrews explains that the new means of procuring this forgiveness (10:17) is through the self-offering of Jesus. The new covenant context in which the author places his treatment of the heavenly sanctuary indicates that his interest lies in the arrival of the eschatological events announced by Jeremiah.

Hebrews 8:1–2

These verses establish the main point (κεφάλαιον)¹³⁰ of what is being said: Jesus, the high priest has sat down at the right hand of God in fulfilment of the invitation of Ps 110:1, as a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent pitched by the Lord, not a human. It is useful to compare the allusion to Ps 110:1 in Heb 8:1 with that in Heb 1:3. This will highlight the different use that is made of the Psalm.

Hebrews 1:2–3

...ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων
ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ...καθαρισμὸν
τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν
ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς,

Hebrews 8:1–2

Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις,
τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν
ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν
τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,¹³¹ τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργός

128 See the discussion of Heb 8 in Westfall 2005: 188–96. I am in general agreement with Westfall's analysis.

129 Attridge 1989: 216; Sterling 2001: 193–94.

130 BDAG 541. Löhr 2005: 202–3 discusses this word as a *terminus technicus* in classical rhetoric. It appears six times in the LXX (Lev 5:24; Num 4:2; 5:7; 31:26, 49; Dan 7:1). In Acts 22:8 it refers a sum of money (as in Lev 5:24; Josephus *Ant.* 12.30, 155). It has the sense of “main point” in Josephus *Ant.* 16.290; 17.93, 182, 303, 314; *J. W.* 1.502. Philo uses the adjective κεφάλαιος forty-nine times in a variety of senses.

131 MS 33, some manuscripts of the Vulgate, and Eusebius read ὑψηλοῖς here in place of τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, assimilating this text to Heb 1:3.

τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα

καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος,¹³² οὐκ ἄνθρωπος.

... in these last days God has spoken in a Son... who, having made purification for sins sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heights, becoming as much greater than the angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs.

The main point of the things being said is that we have such a high priest who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent pitched by the Lord, not a human.

As in Heb 1:3, the present middle imperative κάθου ("sit down") of the Psalm has been changed to the aorist active indicative ἐκάθισεν ("he sat down"); and ἐκ δεξιῶν ("on the right") changed to ἐν δεξιᾷ ("on the right"). This allusion differs from that in 1:3 in the change in the subject of the verb ἐκάθισεν from υἱός ("son") to ἀρχιερέυς ("high priest"); the addition of ὁ θρόνος ("the throne"); and the replacement of the words ἐν ὑψηλοῖς ("in the heights") with ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ("in heaven").

The subject of the verb ἐκάθισεν (ἀρχιερέυς) recalls the treatment of Ps 110:4, which is the main subject of the section from 4:14–7:28, and constitutes an allusion to that Psalm, although the Psalm itself uses the word ἱερέυς.¹³³ It also

132 The second reviser of $\aleph$, A, and the second reviser of D, followed by a number of other witnesses and versions, and the Majority Text add καὶ here, softening the asyndeton. The καὶ is absent from P⁴⁶, the original hand of $\aleph$, B and the original hand of D, and several other witnesses. The combination of P⁴⁶, $\aleph$, and B is considered to be very strong attestation in Hebrews, being three of the four "category 1" manuscripts in Ellingworth's list, which he notes "should always be considered in establishing the original text" (Ellingworth 1993, *ibid.*: 81–82). The other category 1 manuscript here is A, which includes the longer reading. Thomas 1965: 305 notes that in 12 places in Hebrews where variant readings exist, the combination of P⁴⁶, $\aleph$, and B is considered original. Thomas does not list these occurrences, but an examination of the critical apparatus in NA²⁸ gives the following instances where this combination is considered original: Heb 1:2, 8; 3:3, 6, 9, 10; 4:2, 5; 5:3, 4; 6:3, 14, 16; 7:6, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22; 8:2, 4, 11, 12. In some cases there is more than one variant in the verse.

133 The alternate descriptions of Jesus as a "priest" (ἱερέυς) and as a "high priest" (ἀρχιερέυς) have caused some consternation to readers of Hebrews. The author is concerned to establish that Jesus is a high priest so that he can argue that his self-offering corresponds typologically with the actions of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, but the text he uses to establish that he is a priest (Ps 110:4) refers not to a high priest but to a priest. Jesus is

takes the reader back to the closing summary in 7:26–28, which begins with a description of this high priest as τοιοῦτος . . . ἀρχιερεύς (“such a high priest”), words picked up in 8:1 with τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα (“we have such a high priest”).¹³⁴

The situation of the exalted Son was described in 1:3 as ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλowsύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. Here, the words ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (“in the heights”) have been replaced by ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“in heaven”) and the word θρόνος (“throne”) has been added. The high priest is at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven. That God is enthroned in heaven is well attested in the OT (Ps 11:4; 47:8; Isa 6:1; Ezek 1:26), in the NT (Rev 7:15–17) and in other literature of Second Temple Judaism (1 En. 14:18; 3 En. 7), but only in Zech 6:13 (LXX) and Heb 8:1 is there an enthroned high priest.¹³⁵ Zechariah 6:9–15 is an oracle from YHWH, commanding the prophet to make a golden crown and place it “upon the head of Joshua the high priest” (ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ . . . τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ μεγάλου, 6:13). This symbolic action is then explained with reference to one called “Sprout” who would sprout and build the house of YHWH.¹³⁶ Zech 6:13 continues with reference to this “Sprout” as follows: καὶ αὐτός . . . κατάρξει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἱερεύς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ (“and he will sit on his throne, and will be a priest at his right hand”).

Evidence for the identification of an echo of Zech 6:9–15 includes the context of temple building in Zech 6 and the true tent pitched by the Lord in

only called a “priest” (ἱερεύς) in texts where Ps 110:4 is in the frame (5:6; 7:11, 15, 17, 21), or when comparing him in general terms with Levitical priests (8:4); elsewhere he is a “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς, 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, 15; 5:5, 10, 6:20; 7:26, 27, 28; 8:1, 3; 9:11), or in one instance (10:21) a “great priest” (ἱερεύς μέγας). That the term high priest is what the author wants to convey is evident in that the three concluding summaries containing allusions to Ps 110:4 use the word ἀρχιερεύς (5:10; 6:20; 7:28), and in that Jesus is never referred to with the term ἱερεύς after Heb 7. See O’Brien 2010: 278 (note 194).

134 Westfall 2005: 190.

135 Lane 1991a, *ibid.*: 205 refers to a “secondary allusion” to Zech 6:13, as does Koester 2001: 375. Synge 1959: 25, who attributes the recognition of this allusion to Justin, considers that the words of 8:1, “who sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven” are an echo not so much of Ps 110, as of Zech 6:13. See Justin *Dial.* 115: οὕτω καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐν βαβυλῶνι Ἰησοῦ ἱερέως γενομένου ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὑμῶν ἀποκάλυψιν, ἔρχομαι νῦν ἀποδείξαι ἀποκήρυξιν εἶναι τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἱερέως, καὶ θεοῦ, καὶ Χριστοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων (PG 6: 741–44, “so I proceed now to show that the revelation made among your people in Babylon in the days of Joshua the priest, was an announcement of the things to be accomplished by our Priest, who is God, and Christ the Son of God the Father of all,” ET Coxse 1996: 498–99).

136 The NRSV (and many other EVV) translate the Hebrew word פִּנְיָ with “Branch”. For the translation “Sprout” see HALOT 1033–34, and Rose 2000: 91–93.

Heb 8:2; the words ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ in Zech 6:13 and Heb 8:1;¹³⁷ the use of μέγας as a qualifier for the “high” priest in Zech 6:11 (see Heb 4:14 and 10:21 for the use of this qualifier for Jesus); and the mention of the throne in Zech 6:13 and Heb 8:1. The text combines Zech 6:13 with Ps 110:1, indicating that the eschatological temple anticipated in Zechariah is in view.¹³⁸

The high priest is enthroned “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανόις), a statement that picks up Heb 4:14 where the “great high priest” (ἀρχιερέα μέγαν) ministers in heaven, and 7:26 where he is exalted above the heavens. Lane argues that these claims demonstrate that the high priest is exalted to the highest possible place,¹³⁹ but there is more than this here. The allusion to Ps 110:1 brings with it the earlier allusion in Heb 1:3, where his exaltation is said to have taken place “in these last days” (Heb 1:2), and the claim of Heb 1:6 that he is exalted in “the world to come” (Heb 1:6; 2:5). Thus, his exaltation is more than just exaltation to the highest place; it is exaltation to the highest place in the world to come, as a signal that the eschatological moment has arrived. Secondly, that he is designated a high priest implies that heaven is to be understood as a temple,¹⁴⁰ an idea reflected in Heb 8:2, which describes him as “a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent which the Lord has pitched, not a human” (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος).¹⁴¹ Considerable debate surrounds these words.

137 The MT of Zech 6:13 reads וְהָיָה כֹהֵן עַל כִּסְאוֹ. As Baldwin 1972: 144 notes, the MT has the high priest enthroned, a comment “so unusual as to make the translator hesitate,” and substitute “on his right hand” for “on his throne.”

138 For an eschatological temple in Zechariah see *ibid.*: 144–45; Smith 1984: 217–19; Petersen 1985: 275–78; Rooke 2000: 146–49. Baldwin 1972: 145–46 argues that the temple referred in Zechariah cannot be that built by Zerubbabel since it was already being built. She continues, “[l]ike many other prophetic passages . . . [Zech 6] was concerned with the focal point of all history, the coming of the Davidic king, who would transform the concepts of Temple and leadership.” Smith 1984: 219 suggests that the reference to those who are “afar off” building the temple of YHWH in Zech 6:15 is to another [eschatological] temple. Whether or not this suggestion is valid, the oracle here influences speculation about the temple and has apparently had an influence on the text of Hebrews at this point. I discuss the implications of the allusion to Zech 6:13 in Church 2008: 156–57.

139 Lane 1991a: 192. See also Attridge 1989: 139.

140 DeSilva 2000b: 28. See 1 En. 14:8–23; 90:28–29; T. Levi 5:1. Johnson 2006: 198 refers to the picture of heaven as the true sanctuary as “the great imaginative leap of the composition . . . If what defines a sanctuary is the presence of God, where God essentially and eternally exists must be the real ‘holy place.’”

141 The neuter plural of the adjective ἅγιος routinely refers to the sanctuary in Hebrews. See Heb 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11. For this usage in the LXX see Exod 29:30; 36:1, 8; 39:1; Lev 5:15; 10:4; 19:30; 20:3, 12; 26:2, 31; 27:25; Num 3:32; 4:12, 15; 8:19; 18:3; 19:20; 31:6;

The word λειτουργός appears in secular Greek literature for those who perform various kinds of community service,¹⁴² as also in the LXX where it also has a cultic sense in several texts.¹⁴³ It appears twice in Hebrews and three times in the remainder of the NT with a variety of senses.¹⁴⁴ Significant here is the nature of the relationship between λειτουργός and its dependent genitive τῶν ἁγίων. It is commonly read as a reference to the sanctuary “in which” this minister serves,¹⁴⁵ although the genitive is more correctly “of the sanctuary.”¹⁴⁶ It does not specify so much the location where the high priest serves, but the fact that his service is carried out in connection with the heavenly sanctuary.¹⁴⁷

3 Kgdms 8:6; 2 Chr 5:9, 11; 29:21; Ps 133:2 (LXX); Isa 43:28; Jer 28:51 (LXX); Ezek 5:11; 21:7; 23:38; 24:21; 25:3; 37:26, 28; 44:8, 9; 11; 13, 16; 47:12; 48:10, 21; Dan 8:13; Mal 2:11; Jdt 4:12; 8:21, 24; 9:8; 16:20; 1 Macc 3:51, 58, 59; 4:36, 41, 43, 48; 7:42; 14:15, 29, 31; 15:7; 2 Macc 15:17; Sir 45:24; Pss. Sol. 1:8; 2:3; 8:11.

142 BDAG 591–92; Johnson 2006: 198.

143 It is used alongside ἱερεὺς (“priest”) in Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; in lists of cultic officials in 2 Esd 7:24; 20:39, and refers to Simon’s service at the altar in Sir 50:14. O’Brien 2010: 288 also refers to Jer 33:21, but this verse is absent from the LXX.

144 See Heb 1:7 (for the service of angels, quoting Ps 103:4, LXX); 8:2. Outside of Hebrews it appears in Rom 13:6; 15:16; Phil 2:25. In Rom 15:16 Paul refers to his call to be a “minister” (λειτουργός) of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles and to what he does as “priestly service of God’s good news” (ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ).

145 Moffatt 1924: 103; Hughes 1977: 280; Wilson 1987: 132; Ellingworth 1993: 400 (“the place of Christ’s ministry”); Guthrie 1998: 277–79; Mitchell 2007: 159; Thompson 2008: 182–83; Allen 2010: 441. O’Brien 2010: 287 translates “a minister in the sanctuary,” while on p. 288 he uses the expression “a *minister* of the sanctuary.”

146 Attridge 1989: 216; Bruce 1990: 180; Lane 1991a: 205; DeSilva 2000b: 279; Koester 2001: 374; Johnson 2006: 196.

147 In the NT λειτουργός is always qualified by a genitive substantive, but apart from Heb 8:2 the genitive is a genitive of the person served. It appears fourteen times in the LXX (2 Kgdms 13:18; 3 Kgdms 10:5; 4 Kgdms 4:43; 6:15; 2 Chr 9:24; 2 Esd 7:24; 20:40; Ps 102.21; 103:4; Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; 10:2; 50:14; 3 Macc 5:5), and in ten of these it is qualified by a genitive of the person served. In two of the other four (Neh 10:40 and 3 Macc 5:5), the word is used absolutely. In one (Sir 50:14) it is followed by the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ βωμῶν (“at altars”). The other instance is 2 Esd 7:24, which describes certain cultic officials as λειτουργοὶ οἴκου θεοῦ (“ministers of the house of God”), without suggesting that they were presently engaged in service “in” the temple. The Aramaic *Vorlage* reads פִּלְחֵי בֵּית דָּנָה אֱלֹהֵא, which the NRSV renders “servants of this house of God.” Philo uses λειτουργός eleven times (*Leg.* 3.135; *Post.* 184; *Somn.* 2.186, 231; *Mos.* 2.94, 149, 276; *Spec.* 1.152, 249; 4.191; *Virt.* 74) and in six of these it is followed by a genitive of the person served. Of the remainder, *Leg.* 3.135 refers to a person who administers holy things (λειτουργός τῶν ἁγίων); in *Mos.* 2.94; *Spec.* 1.152; *Virt.* 74 it is used absolutely; and *Mos.* 2.276 refers to τῶν περὶ τὸν νεῶν λειτουργῶν (“the ministers of the temple”).

When Heb 8:2 is read with reference to Jesus serving “in the heavenly sanctuary” it conveys the idea that the heavenly sanctuary is a structure in heaven. But if the heavenly sanctuary is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, the “temple” that God was expected to build in the last days, now in place with the exaltation of Christ to God’s right hand “in these last days” (Heb 1:2), then it need not be understood in that way.¹⁴⁸

Two questions arise in connection with the other description of the heavenly temple, “the true tent pitched by the Lord and no human” (ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος). The first question surrounds the sense of the word ἀληθινός. This word has the sense of “genuine, authentic or real,”¹⁴⁹ but a number of scholars consider that it also has the sense of “eternal.”¹⁵⁰ With Hurst, I note that this tent is said to have been pitched by the Lord, something that could hardly be said about a tent that was eternal.¹⁵¹ Furthermore, the word αἰώνιος appears six times in Hebrews to describe salvation (5:9), judgment (6:2), redemption (9:12), spirit (9:14), inheritance (9:15) and covenant

148 Schenck 2007: 186–89.

149 BDAG 43; Johnson 2006: 199. The word appears fifty times in the LXX and twenty-eight times in the NT, three of which are in Hebrews. It appears once in Luke 16:11 (true riches); once in Paul (1 Thess 1:9, the true God); nine times in John (1:9; 4:23, 37; 6:32; 7:28; 8:16; 15:1; 17:3; 19:35); four times in 1 John (2:8; and three times in 5:29); and 10 times in Revelation (3:7, 14; 6:10; 15:3; 16:7; 19:2, 9, 11; 21:5; 22:6). In Heb 8:2; 9:24 it describes the true sanctuary, and in 10:22 a true heart.

150 Delitzsch 1868: 2:19 (“not temporal and typical, merely, but antitypical, archetypal and eternal”); Barrett 1954: 384 (“the true tabernacle exists eternally in heaven”); Bultmann 1964: 250 (“[i]n Hellenism it also takes on the sense of “real as eternal” or “real as mediated by revelation”); Sowers 1965: 107; Hughes 1977: 282 (“the imperishable holy of holies”); Peterson 1982: 131 (“fundamentally [it] means that it is eternal in character”); Lane 1991a: 205; Koester 2001: 374; O’Brien 2010: 289. Aside from Heb 8:2; 9:24 where these scholars suggest that ἀληθινός has the sense “eternal,” nowhere else in the NT is this sense appropriate. The reading arises from a Platonic understanding of Hebrews as Sowers 1965: 107 suggests. Philo uses the word eighteen times (*Leg.* 1.32, 35; 3.52; *Det.* 10; *Gig.* 33; *Her.* 162; *Congr.* 101, 159; *Fug.* 17, 82, 131; *Somn.* 2.193; *Mos.* 1.289; *Spec.* 1.332; *Virt.* 78; *Praem.* 41, 104; *Legat.* 366), nowhere with the sense of “eternal,” although in *Leg.* 1.32, 35; 3.52 it qualifies ζωή. Colson renders this expression with “real life” in all three texts (Philo 1929–1962: 167, 169, 227), although Yonge 1993: 56 renders it with “eternal life” in 3.52.

151 Hurst 1990: 37–38 also refers to Farrar (without any bibliographical detail), as saying that, for the author the tent is an “uncreated eternal archetype” (p. 29). Farrar 1893: 105 uses the words “[d]ivine and eternal archetype(s),” and “Heavenly Ideal” to refer to the “genuine tabernacle” of this verse. In his introduction Farrar refers to the heavenly world as being “supersensuous, immaterial, immoveable, eternal” (*ibid.*: xlv).

(13:20). If the author intended to say that the tent was eternal, the normal word was ready at hand. Rather than describing the tent as “eternal,” Heb 8:2 describes it as “genuine,” “authentic” or “true.”

The implication of this is that sanctuaries constructed by humans are in some sense inauthentic, but this need not be understood in a pejorative sense.¹⁵² The language anticipates Heb 8:5, which describes the temple as a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things.¹⁵³ Thus, the tabernacle where God camped with his people in the wilderness was the figurative tabernacle,¹⁵⁴ and the Jerusalem temple a figurative temple, both prefiguring the real or authentic dwelling of God with his people in the eschaton.¹⁵⁵

The second question relates to the sense of the word καί in the expression τῶν ἁγίων . . . καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς (“the sanctuary . . . and the true tent”). Is this καί to be read as explicative or as copulative? If the former, the expression refers to the totality of the heavenly sanctuary (the sanctuary, that is, the true tent); if the latter, the text envisages a bicameral sanctuary, made up of an inner shrine surrounded by an outer tent, similar to the earthly sanctuary. On this reading “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) is the inner shrine and “the tent” (ἡ σκηνή) the outer court surrounding this shrine. A related question is whether, if the καί is explicative, the text envisages the heavenly temple as corresponding to the inner shrine of the earthly temple or to the entire temple complex.

A number of scholars, noting that the expression τῶν ἁγίων . . . καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς is followed by a singular relative pronoun, argue that the καί in this expression is explicative, and that the expression refers to a “unicameral heavenly sanctuary.”¹⁵⁶ Others consider that the sanctuary is bicameral,

152 Similar language appears in John 15:1, where Jesus describes himself as “the true vine” (ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή), over against Israel, at times represented as a vine or vineyard in the OT, and always in contexts where the nation is under God’s judgement (Hos 10:1–2; Isa 5:1–7; Jer 2:21; Ezek 15:1–5, 17:1–21; 19:10–15; Ps 80:8–18) for failing to produce good fruit. Jesus the true vine does produce good fruit. See Beasley-Murray 1999: 272.

153 I establish this reading of ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in later in this chapter.

154 See the discussion in Beale 2004b: 295. Beale makes the point that “the literal sanctuary is the heavenly one and the figurative sanctuary is the earthly.” And, while his words “literal” and “figurative” might imply a structure in heaven, he also explains that what is “literal” need not be physical. The wilderness tabernacle was physical and figurative, while the heavenly tabernacle is non-physical, but no less real and genuine.

155 I refer here to both tabernacle and temple. I will argue below that the referent of ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5 is the temple rather than the tabernacle. See Walker 1994: 39–71; 1996: 205–8 and my earlier discussion in Church 2013a: 119–20.

156 Gordon 2008: 109. These scholars include Moffatt 1924: 104–5; Braun 1984: 228; Bruce 1990: 180; Lane 1991a: 200, 205; Ellingworth 1993: 402; Koester 2001: 374, 376; O’Brien 2010: 288;

comprising “the holy of holies” (τὰ ἅγια) and “the outertent” (ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή).¹⁵⁷ Discussion of this issue often revolves around the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev 16 and the significance of the bicameral earthly sanctuary to that ritual. Hofius refers to Lev 16:20 where, as part of that ritual, the high priest is directed to make atonement for “the sanctuary” (τὸ ἅγιον) and “the tent of meeting” (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου),¹⁵⁸ a verse Hofius finds reflected in Heb 9:21–24.¹⁵⁹ Scholer refers to Lev 16:16, 33 where a distinction is also maintained between the inner sanctuary and the tent.¹⁶⁰ And Rissi argues that in Hebrews τὰ ἅγια (plural and definite) always refers to the inner tent, and when the word is used indefinitely it refers to the sanctuary in general.¹⁶¹ These scholars conclude, therefore, that in an allusion to Lev 16, Heb 8:2 refers to a bicameral heavenly sanctuary. This, it is claimed, prepares the way for the comparison between the self-offering of Christ and the former Day of Atonement ritual, which is the subject of Heb 9–10.

Calaway 2013: 105. Peterson 1982: 130–131; Isaacs 1997: 275 and Johnson 2006:199 refer to the expression as a hendiadys. A hendiadys is two nouns expressing a single idea in place of a noun and a qualifier (Burton 1996–2003), which is not what we have here. Attridge 1989: 218 notes it is more accurate to describe the expression as two synonyms connected by an explicative καί.

157 Delitzsch 1868: 2: 18–19; Westcott 1892: 211–214; Koester 1962: 309; Vanhoye 1965: 4; Hofius 1972: 59; Sabourin 1973: 199, 203; Rissi 1987: 38; Attridge 1989: 217; Scholer 1991: 155, 160–61; Thompson 2008: 173; Barnard 2012: 93–94. Attridge 1989: 218 notes that what the author intends by this distinction requires further clarification, and Lane 1991a: 201 comments, “There is . . . no common agreement among these writers as to the theological significance of the distinction.” She 2011: 129 argues for a bicameral sanctuary in Heb 8:2, citing an unpublished paper as his authority for the claim that “epexegetical καί cannot be present when it joins a plural and a singular” (Shea 1989). I have not seen Shea’s paper. This rule is not specified in the discussions of epexegetical or explicative καί in Robertson 1914: 1181; Moulton and Turner 1963: 335; BDF 228–29, § 442 (9); BDAG 495, s.v. καί, c. No other scholar who argues for a bicameral sanctuary refers to this rule.

158 The LXX expression ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου is, of course, “tent of witness.” The Hebrew *Vorlage* is מוֹעֵד, either “a meeting place” or “an agreed time for meeting” (HALOT 557–58). It appears that the LXX translators mistook this word for מַעֲיֵד, the hiphil participle of עָוָה (“to witness, be a witness,” HALOT 795). See Wevers 1990: 442. The Hebrew noun תְּדוּת (“witness, testimony”) in the expression הָעֵדוּת אֲרוֹן appears in the LXX as ἡ κιβωτός τοῦ μαρτυρίου (“ark of testimony”). Both expressions appear in Exod 30:26, where the LXX renders both מוֹעֵד and עֵדוּת with μαρτύριον.

159 Hofius 1972: 59–60.

160 Scholer 1991: 160–61.

161 Rissi 1987: 38–9. See Heb 8:2; 9:8, 12, 25; 10:19; 13:11.

However, this is not a necessary deduction. While Rissi might be right in identifying τὰ ἄγια (plural and definite) as a reference to the inner tent in the wilderness tabernacle, it is not so clear that this applies to the heavenly temple and, furthermore, in Hebrews ἡ σκηνή does not always refer to the outer tent.¹⁶² While Heb 9–10 refers to the former Day of Atonement ritual and the significance of the bicameral sanctuary for that ritual, the author does not exploit that aspect of the ritual in discussing the self-offering of Christ. He is more interested in the relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries than the relationship between supposed inner and outer compartments of the heavenly sanctuary. I will argue later in this chapter that ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνή (“the greater and more perfect tent”) in Heb 9:11 is a metaphor for the new order, and that this expression most naturally refers back to “the true tent” (ἡ σκηνή ἡ ἀληθινή) of 8:2. I conclude that the καὶ in Heb 8:2 is best understood as καὶ explicative, and that the expression is to be understood as referring to the heavenly sanctuary, envisaged as a heavenly “holy of holies,” symbolising access to the presence of God, and the ultimate dwelling of God with his people.¹⁶³ The expression identifies the sanctuary that the high priest serves as τὰ ἄγια (“the sanctuary”), which it then defines more closely as ἡ σκηνή ἡ ἀληθινή (“the true tent”).

Rather than describing the heavenly sanctuary as the holy of holies surrounded by the true tent, the text refers to the “genuine” or “real” (ἀληθινή) tent ἣν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (“which the Lord has pitched, and not a human”). This is an allusion to Num 24:6 (LXX), part of Balaam’s third oracle addressed to the Israelite tribes encamped in the desert with YHWH (Num 24:5–9). While several scholars mention this allusion and, indeed, the presence of a number of other words in the context of both passages seems to indicate that Balaam’s oracle was in the author’s mind, many consider that it adds little to the understanding of Hebrews.¹⁶⁴ However, there is more to this

162 In Heb 8:5 the “tent” (σκηνή) refers to the entire complex; in Heb 9:2, 3, 6 both the inner and outer parts of the wilderness tabernacle are referred to as tents.

163 The ideas are similar to Rev 21:15–27 where the holy city is a cube, the size of the then known world (with each plane around 2,400 km). The cube is reminiscent of the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle, enlarged to encompass the entire earth, and symbolising God’s dwelling with his people (Rev 21:3).

164 Moffatt 1924:105 suggests a reminiscence of Num 24:6 and Exod 33:7. Nairne 1957: 81 notes that the verbal parallels are with Num 24:6, but that “the underlying thought is with Ex. xxiv.18–xxv.40”; and Hughes 1977: 282 refers only to Exod 33:7. See also Wilson 1987: 133; Lane 1991a: 205 for passing references to Num 24:6. Gordon 2008: 109 calls the allusion a “purely verbal parallel”; and Mitchell 2007: 161 thinks the image from Num 24:6 is

allusion than at first appears. In the Balaam oracle, God and his people are seen camping together in the wilderness in the former tent pitched by Moses; in Hebrews, God and his people will dwell together in the true tent pitched by the Lord, God's eschatological dwelling with his people.¹⁶⁵

Hebrews 8:3–5

In the introduction to Part Two (above) I argued that Heb 8:3–4 compares the heavenly priesthood of Christ with the contemporary earthly priesthood. If this is the case, Heb 8:5a, which refers to the location of the service of these priests, refers not to the tabernacle in the wilderness but to the temple, which it describes as a *ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά . . . τῶν ἐπουρανίων*.¹⁶⁶ In what follows I will argue that v. 5a refers not to the wilderness tabernacle as a “copy and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary” (*ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά . . . τῶν ἐπουρανίων*), that appears in Heb 8:1–2,¹⁶⁷ but to the Jerusalem temple, and that the words *ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά . . . τῶν ἐπουρανίων* are to be read as “symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things.” Thus Heb 8:5a expresses a contrast between the earthly temple and the heavenly temple which it foreshadowed, and is part of the author's polemic against the Jerusalem temple. The polemic is, however, quite different

“somewhat accidental.” Ellingworth 1993: 402–3 notes Isa 42:15 (sic, the reference is to Isa 42:5); Isa 40:22; Exod 33:7; 1 Chr 16:1 as other possible parallels. Of these, Exod 33:7 is the most appropriate, with Heb 8:2 contrasting the action of Moses pitching the tent of meeting with the Lord pitching the “true” tent.

165 In Church 2008: 145–57 I argue for a clear allusion to the LXX of Num 24:6. Recognising this allusion adds considerably to the understanding of this text. As I also argued (pp. 147–49), there are echoes of the Eden sanctuary in Balaam's oracle that carry over to Hebrews, so that in Heb 8:1–2 protology and eschatology are combined. The “true tent” looks back to Eden and forward to the consummation of all things when God will dwell with his people. See my earlier discussion of this phenomenon in connection with Sir 24 (chapter 2, above). That the author of Hebrews had this eschatological sanctuary in mind is clear from the echoes of 1 Sam 2:35 and 1 Chr 17:14 in Heb 3:1–6; the echo of 1 Sam 2:35 in Heb 4:14; the allusion to Zech 6:13 in Heb 8:1; and the echo of Exod 15:17 in Heb 12:16, all texts that were understood to refer to the building of the eschatological temple. That *ΥΗΩΗ* will build this temple is clear from Exod 15:17. The idea also appears in 11QTemple xxix 7–9; 4QmidrEschat^a; Jub 1:17, 32. For this reading of Heb 8:2 see Beale 2004b: 294–99; O'Brien 2010: 289.

166 I leave this expression untranslated for the moment.

167 Of the numerous scholars who adopt this view I cite Moffatt 1924: 105; Johnson 2006: 202; O'Brien 2010: 290. Many of these scholars read the expression pejoratively, as does Attridge 1989: 219 who claims that the expression emphasises “the inferiority of the earthly temple.” A pejorative reading is not necessary (see Koester 2001: 382–84).

from that evident in the literature discussed in Part One of this study where the temple and priesthood were considered to be corrupt as at Qumran, or the whole enterprise of the second temple mistaken as, for example, in the Animal Apocalypse or the Apocalypse of Weeks. In Hebrews the temple, as also the tabernacle, anticipates the eschatological dwelling of God with his people as a “symbolic foreshadowing” of that, and now that the reality has come with the exaltation of Christ it is no longer valid as the place where God is encountered.

But if Heb 8:5a is about the temple, what of Heb 8:5b and its citation of Exod 25:40? Certainly that refers to the tabernacle. Most scholars read the verse as a whole, and indeed it is part of a sentence that spans vv. 4–6. But as Hurst says, 8:5a and b “should not be so easily run together.”¹⁶⁸ The verse in total claims a relationship between the earthly temple and “the heavenly things” (an expression I argue below refers to the eschatological temple), and it supports this from a text in the Torah that establishes a relationship between the tabernacle and a pattern shown to Moses on the mountain.¹⁶⁹ That the author quoted from a text referring to the tabernacle rather than the temple is probably because there is no text referring to the divine design of either Solomon’s temple or indeed the second temple. Tabernacle and temple were Israel’s earthly shrines, and it is enough for the text to show the divine origin of the one shrine that was erected according to God’s instructions.¹⁷⁰

A Symbolic Foreshadowing of the Heavenly Things

Hebrews 8:5 describes the Jerusalem temple as a ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά . . . τῶν ἐπουρανίων, an expression that I translate as “a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things.” The author substantiates this claim by citing Exod 25:40. The quotation differs from the LXX with the addition of πάντα (“everything”), and the use of the aorist participle δειχθέντα (“shown”) in place of the perfect passive participle δεδειγμένον (“shown”). While it is impossible to know

168 Hurst 1990: 15.

169 It would be a diversion to discuss the nature of what God showed Moses on the mountain.

170 See Michaels 2009: 391; Barnard 2012: 90–91 (note 13). Exodus gives full details of the plan and construction of the tabernacle as revealed to Moses on the mountain. 1 Chr 28:11–19 explains how David gave Solomon the plan, but it seems to be not God’s plan but David’s plan, although v. 19 does refer to the details coming from “the hand of YHWH” (מִיַּד יְהוָה).

whether or not the author introduced these changes since his precise *Vorlage* cannot be identified,¹⁷¹ most scholars assume that he did.¹⁷²

Ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά is a hendiadys and it is important to ascertain the contribution of each word to the single idea expressed. I begin with ὑπόδειγμα, normally read as “copy”—that is the copy that Moses made (ποιέω, Heb 8:5) of the heavenly sanctuary. If we were restricted to the 1979 second edition of Bauer’s lexicon, along with most other NT Greek lexicons from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, we could be forgiven for adopting this reading.¹⁷³

-
- 171 See the critical apparatus in Wevers 1991: 293 for the different MS evidence that includes these readings, although no single MS reads the same as Heb 8:5. The evidence is late and, as Kistemaker 1961: 40 notes, could have been influenced by Irenaeus, Philo or Hebrews. This latter remark applies in particular to the addition of πάντα since Philo includes πάντα in a citation of Exod 25:40 (*Leg.* 3.102; *QE* 2:52); and Irenaeus *Haer.* 4.14.3 cites the text with the word *omnia* (“all”) corresponding to the πάντα in Hebrews. Kistemaker *ibid.*: 136; Williamson 1970: 558; McCullough 1971: 120; Michel 1975: 290; Weiss 1991: 438 refer to an otherwise unknown exegetical tradition common to both Philo and the author of Hebrews. In both Philo and Heb 8:5 the word πάντα qualifies ποιήσεις (“make”), although Philo inverts the sentence. The word “all” appears in the English translation of *QE* 2.52 by Marcus in Philo 1929–1962: Supp 2: 99, but is absent from *QE* 2.82, 90 (pp. 131–32, 139–40).
- 172 Delitzsch 1868: 2: 32–33; Moffatt 1924: 106; D’Angelo 1979: 205; Attridge 1989: 220; Lane 1991a: 207; Ellingworth 1993: 407; DeSilva 2000b: 282; Koester 2001: 378; Johnson 2006: 200. The reason for the addition of πάντα (if that is what it is) may be explained by the author’s use of Exod 25:40, which strictly refers only to the lamp stand rather than Exod 25:9, which is very similar and which includes πᾶς twice, thus the text assimilates Exod 25:40 to 25:9. The choice of Exod 25:40 rather than 25:9 may be due to the appearance of παράδειγμα (“pattern”) in v. 9 where v. 40 uses τύπος (“pattern”). The author has already used ὑπόδειγμα in his sentence, and using παράδειγμα could have caused confusion, since in Exod 25:9 παράδειγμα refers to the pattern Moses saw and in Heb 8:5 ὑπόδειγμα refers to the temple. Schenck 2007: 118 notes that παράδειγμα is a “more Platonic term” and that if the author “meant his readers to take the verse Platonically, he failed miserably.” Scholars assign varying weights to the substitution of δεχθέντα for δεδειγμένον, with Thomas 1965: 309 considering that the author found in his *Vorlage* a text that could indicate that in the present the heavenly sanctuary permanently remains a τύπος for the earthly one, and that this would never do: while it may have been the case in the past, it was now no longer the case, for the earthly reality has given way to the heavenly and has been made obsolete. For this view see also Attridge 1989: 220; Ellingworth 1993: 407. However, the change seems rather too subtle to bear this weight (Delitzsch 1868:2: 33; McCullough 1971: 12).
- 173 Robinson 1876: 812 gives two senses: an example for imitation or as a warning, and a copy or likeness taken from an original, with Heb 8:5 and 9:23 as the only NT examples of the latter sense. Thayer 1898: 642–43 has the same two senses, again citing only Heb 8:5 and 9:23 for the sense of “copy.” *PGL* 1447 has five senses: a model or pattern, a precept, a fixed period (hesitatingly), a copy, for which Lampe lists Heb 8:5 and 9:35 (sic), and an

But there are better tools than these. According to *LSJ* the word has the following senses: “sign, token, indication . . . illustration, picture showing how something is to be done . . . pattern . . . example . . . instance or specimen.”¹⁷⁴ *LSJ* nowhere suggests “copy” as an appropriate rendering. The same applies to *BDAG*. Here there are two definitions, the first being “example model, pattern” and the second being “an indication of someth[ing] that appears at a subsequent time, *outline, sketch, symbol*.”¹⁷⁵

But we do not need to rely on the lexicons. Ὑπόδειγμα appears five times in the LXX. In four of these it has the sense of a moral example to be avoided or imitated,¹⁷⁶ while in the fifth (Ezek 42:15), it has the sense of “pattern” or “outline.”¹⁷⁷ The statistics in the NT are similar. Ὑπόδειγμα has the sense of

illustration or figure. *EDNT* 4: 402 reflects this general trend, with the meaning “copy” only given for Heb 8:5; 9:23. Moulton and Milligan 1930: 657 give two senses, example and specimen. Spicq (*TLNT* 403–5) discusses the use of this word in classical sources and gives the sense of “specimen, sample” (p. 403). Then he makes the curious claim that, “In Heb 4:11; 8:5; 9:23, whether with regard to disobedience or with regard to the earthly sanctuary as a copy of the heavenly sanctuary, a *hypodeigma* is always a reproduction.” How the word can possibly have this sense in Heb 4:11 escapes me. Martin 1976: 2: 291 proposes that the sense “copy” is restricted to Heb 8:5; 9:23. *BADG* 844 includes the sense “copy, imitation” with only Heb 8:5 and 9:23 as examples. Finally Schlier 1964: 33 wants both senses for Heb 8:6 (sic). In note 2 he writes “for Christianity . . . the Jewish σαχηγή provided only an obscure copy,” while in the text he states, “. . . they are also, in the sense of Hebrews, models which point to these heavenly things.

174 *LSJ* 1878.

175 *BDAG* 1037.

176 Sir 44:16; 2 Macc 6:28, 31; 4 Macc 17:23. Aquila renders תבנית with ὑπόδειγμα in Deut 4:17 and Ezek 8:10, where it appears to have the sense of “image” or “representation” (Field 1870: 1: 279; 2: 788; Reider and Turner 1966: 246). In Deut 4:17 LXX reads ὁμοίωμα, and Ezek 8:10 LXX reads ὁμοίωσις. However, Aquila must be treated with caution, since, as Field 2005: 46 points out, Aquila always attempts to express Hebrew words with the same Greek words, “without any consideration of the meaning in context.” For the characteristics of Aquila’s version see Katz and Ziegler 1958: 272–73; Field 2005: 37–56 and Marcos 2000: 116–17, who notes that Aquila “translates Hebrew words with an eye on etymology, even though his procedure produces semantic shifts in Greek that are difficult to fit into the context.” There is no extant text of Aquila for any of the other instances of תבנית in the Hebrew Bible thus it is unclear how he renders this word elsewhere. Ὑπόδειγμα appears six times in Josephus, always as an “example” (*J.W.* 1.374, 507; 2.208, 397; 6.103, 106). It also appears with the same sense in *Let. Aris.* 143; 4 Macc 17:23; Eupolemus *Frag.* 2, 34:5, where it refers to Solomon constructing the lamp stand for the temple, using as a “model” (ὕποδειγμα) the lamp stand placed in the tabernacle by Moses.

177 Hurst 1990: 14.

a moral example to be followed or avoided four times,¹⁷⁸ leaving two other instances (Heb 8:5; 9:23). Numerous scholars propose that it means “copy” here, calling on Philo for help. But Philo is actually not much help. He never uses ὑπόδειγμα with reference to temple or tabernacle, and when he uses the near synonym παράδειγμα, it refers not to what Moses made, but to what Moses saw and used as a pattern to construct the tabernacle.¹⁷⁹ Philo uses this word to give the tabernacle a stamp of divine approval and great dignity, being modelled after a heavenly pattern (παράδειγμα).¹⁸⁰

The editors of BDAG refer to an essay by Lincoln Hurst,¹⁸¹ where, as well as in his later monograph,¹⁸² he points out “[t]here is no instance in known Greek literature where ὑπόδειγμα can be demonstrated to mean ‘copy.’”¹⁸³ Furthermore, he argues that it actually has the opposite sense, that is, “a basis for something which comes later.”¹⁸⁴ Indeed, BDAG notes that Attic writers rejected ὑπόδειγμα in favour of its near synonym παράδειγμα. Indeed, nobody ever suggests that παράδειγμα has the sense of “copy;” it is always an example or pattern for imitation.¹⁸⁵

178 John 13:15; Heb 4:11; Jas 5:10; 2 Pet 2:6.

179 Philo, *Mos.* 2.74.

180 Koester 2001: 383.

181 Hurst 1983: 156–68.

182 Hurst 1990: 13–17.

183 Hurst 1983: 157; 1990: 13. A TLG search of ὑπόδειγμα returns over 3,500 occurrences. Four of these are in Philo (*Post.* 122; *Conf.* 64; *Somn.* 2.3; *Her.* 256). Sterling 2001: 195 claims that in middle Platonism ὑπόδειγμα occasionally has the sense of “example [in the sense of] a copy of the idea that lay behind it,” citing Philo, *Conf.* 64 (Balaam an example of depravity); *Her.* 256 (instances of people being in a trance, which Johnson, *Hebrews*, 202 considers has the sense of “example to be followed”); *Somn.* 2.3 (Jacob’s vision of a ladder as an example of a kind of dream). In none of these cases is the “example” a “copy” of the idea in the same sense as is argued for the earthly shrine as a copy of the heavenly one in Hebrews. These cases would be better described as “instances of a topic being discussed,” rather than “copies of an idea.” Nevertheless, Sterling considers that the author of Hebrews understood the term in this way, and that in Heb 8:5 ὑπόδειγμα refers to “an example derived from the heavenly τύπος.” That ὑπόδειγμα can have the sense of example is true, but when it does in the biblical literature it is an example to be copied (or avoided as in Heb 4:11).

184 Hurst 1990: 55.

185 BDAG 1037. *LSJ* 1307–8 defines παραδείγματα as “the divine exemplars after which earthly things are made.” There is no entry for παράδειγμα in BDAG, although it treats παραδειγματίζω which it connects with παράδειγμα, glossing it here with “model” (p. 761). See also the treatment of δέικνυμι on pp. 214–15. As Louw-Nida: 1: 339–40, 591 shows, the semantic range of this word group nowhere extends to the sense of a “copy.”

In Heb 8:5 the relationship is further described with the word σκιά (“shadow”). For this word BDAG lists three senses: shade (from light and/or heat); the shadow cast by an object; and a “mere representation of someth[ing] real.”¹⁸⁶ But there is another option, that is, “foreshadowing” of something coming later as BAGD (1979) suggests for Heb 10:1 and Col 2:17.¹⁸⁷ In these texts the context suggests “foreshadowing,” with the word μελλοντων in close proximity. In Heb 8:5 ὑπόδειγμα, referring to the temple as an outline or symbol of something that will come later, gives to σκιά the same forward looking nuance. Thus I argue that the text presents the temple as a “symbolic foreshadowing” (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά) of the heavenly things (τὰ ἐπουράνια).¹⁸⁸

The NRSV reads τὰ ἐπουράνια as a reference to “the heavenly sanctuary,” τὰ ἅγια in Heb 8:2. This would be reasonable if ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά were to be read as “copy and shadow,” but this reading is suspect, and there are other considerations.

An examination of ἐπουράνιος elsewhere in Hebrews clarifies the sense. The word appears six times, four as an attributive adjective¹⁸⁹ and twice as a substantive.¹⁹⁰ As an adjective, it has an eschatological nuance: the

186 BDAG 929.

187 BAGD 755, s.v. σκιά, 2, has a separate sense of “*shadow, foreshadowing*” under which Heb 8:5 and 10:1 are listed, without specifying whether the sense in these verses is shadow or foreshadowing. In the 2000 edition (BDAG 929–30) the sense of “foreshadowing” is included in the third option with Col 2:17 as an example. See also Louw-Nida: 593, §58.65 and Bruce 1990: 184–85.

188 Hurst 1990: 17 argues that the author “deliberately coupled ὑπόδειγμα with σκιά in order to guarantee that the latter would have a forward nuance identical to its usage in 10:1.” Son 2005: 176–80 (followed by Barnard 2012: 12–15) critiques Hurst’s interpretation of ὑπόδειγμα, arguing that Hurst has adopted a dominant meaning of the word (“example” or “pattern”), and not paid enough attention to the discourse situation and the context in Heb 8, which shows that another less frequent meaning (“copy”) is intended. Son rightly notes that the meanings of words can change over time and that words can have different senses in different contexts. However, he fails to recognise that the word only carries the sense of “copy” in Aquila’s literal translation of Deut 4:17 and Ezek 8:10 where the sense is suspect. Attridge 1989: 219, note 41 and Schenck 2007: 118, note 9 also appeal to Aquila for this sense of ὑπόδειγμα. Both Son (p. 179) and Barnard (p. 14) argue for the sense “copy” under the misapprehension that the contrast is spatial rather than temporal. Their argument is circular, since the notion of a spatial contrast depends on reading ὑπόδειγμα as “copy.”

189 Heb 3:1 (“heavenly calling”); 6:4 (“heavenly gift”); 11:16 (“heavenly homeland”); 12:22 (“heavenly Jerusalem”).

190 Heb 8:5; 9:23.

things described as heavenly all have a future orientation.¹⁹¹ As Brady notes, “[t]here is a world to come and a heavenly country, a city to come and a heavenly Jerusalem, good things to come and heavenly things; those who have tasted the heavenly gift have also tasted the powers of the world to come.”¹⁹² The same nuance is present in this text. The “heavenly things” are contrasted with the earthly things that anticipate them. These are the eschatological realities that have come with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God; God’s dwelling with his people in the eschaton.¹⁹³ God showed Moses the heavenly things to come, that is, the eschatological sanctuary, and told him to build a tabernacle to prefigure that.¹⁹⁴

Hebrews 8:6 claims that the ministry of Jesus is superior to that of the earthly priests. But its superiority is not because his is a heavenly ministry as opposed to an earthly one, rather it is because he is mediator of a superior covenant based on superior promises. These promises relate to the forgiveness of sins bringing to an end the requirement for any further offering for sins (10:18). This statement leads into a quotation of Jer 31 (LXX 38):31–34 used to establish that the former covenant (which Heb 9 will make clear is to be understood in terms of the cultic regulations of that covenant) is “worn out” and is about to disappear.¹⁹⁵ Hebrews 9–10 demonstrates how the earthly sanctuary and the

191 Brady 1965: 332–37 examines the expressions “heavenly” and “to come” in Hebrews and concludes that both of these terms “point to one reality: the life of the Christian in the city of the living God” (p. 337).

192 Ibid.: 332.

193 Westcott 1892: 216–17: 216–17 suggests that the “heavenly things” refer to “the ideas of the Divine Presence and the realities of heaven . . . ‘the heavenly order,’ the scene of the spiritual life with the realities that belong to it.” Cf. also Chrysostom *Hom. Heb.* XIV, 3 where the heavenly things of Heb 8:5 are interpreted with a forward-looking reference to the church over against the temple: “The Church is heavenly, and nothing other than Heaven” (οὐρανία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ οὐρανός, PG 63: 112).

194 See the list of things shown to Moses in LAB 19:12–13, including the eschatological temple. To be sure this is Mt Nebo rather than Sinai, but it does reflect a tradition that God showed Moses eschatological realities.

195 The translation “worn out” for παλαιούμενον is from Motyer 2004: 179 (see Heb 1:11 where heavens and earth will wear out, παλαιόω). Motyer also suggests that the author refers to the former covenant, rather than the earthly sanctuary as worn out and about to disappear, as a rhetorical strategy to avoid a “massive ideological assault on the Jerusalem Temple and cultus . . . [going] beyond anything else in the New Testament, severing the link between the heavenly and earthly temples, denying the effectiveness and even the divine origin of the earthly cult . . .” (p. 180).

ministry related to it have this preliminary role, pointing to the heavenly things to come.

Summary and Preliminary Conclusions

The purpose of this pericope in the discourse of Hebrews is to lead into the argument set out in Heb 8:7–13 by way of a quotation from Jeremiah, that the former covenant and its cultic regulations are worn out and are about to disappear. The author achieves his purpose with reference to several parts of the OT, all of which he interprets with an eschatological nuance.

He starts with Ps 110:1 from which he had previously established that Jesus had been enthroned at the right hand of God in the world to come “in these last days.” He combines this text with Ps 110:4 to show that the exalted Son is also an exalted high priest, a minister of the heavenly sanctuary. Hebrews 8:1–2 echoes Zech 6:13 and alludes to Balaam’s third oracle (Num 24:6), both of which imply that the heavenly sanctuary is to be understood in eschatological terms. In this way, he establishes that the heavenly sanctuary of which Jesus is a minister is the sanctuary to be built by God in the last days, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

Having established that Jesus is an exalted high priest he then turns to the earthly sanctuary, which he argues is a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things, now in place with the exaltation of Jesus to God’s right hand. He makes no value judgement as to the relative merits of either sanctuary at this point, but uses his claims that the earthly sanctuary is a pointer to the heavenly things to lead into the quotation of Jer 31:31–34, which demonstrates that God had long ago announced that he would replace the Mosaic covenant with a second, better covenant based on better promises about the forgiveness of sins. These are the “heavenly things”—the new things that have come with the exaltation of Christ. In 9:1–10:18 he will explain how these better promises are brought to fruition through Jesus’s offering of himself. I now turn to Heb 9 and apply the insights gained from this analysis of Heb 8 to demonstrate that my reading of Heb 8 provides a coherent basis for understanding this chapter.

Perspectives from Hebrews 9:1–28; 10:1

Hebrews 9 contains four paragraphs: sanctuary and sacrifice under the former covenant (1–10); the definitive sacrifice of Christ (11–14); a discussion of covenant inauguration (15–22); and the removal of sin through the sacrifice of the Christ (23–28). My main concern is with vv. 11–14. I discuss vv. 1–10 to set the

context and follow my treatment of vv. 11–14 with remarks on the other two paragraphs, and conclude with a discussion of 10:1.

Setting the Context

Hebrews 9:1–5 describes the architecture of the two-part wilderness sanctuary, verse 6 describes the daily sacrifices offered in the outer court of the tabernacle and verse 7 describes the actions of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. After a discussion of the symbolism of the two-part earthly sanctuary (vv. 8–10) the text turns in v. 11 to Christ. Verses 11–12 compare his self-offering with the actions of the former high priest on the Day of Atonement, with the implication of a typological relationship between what the former high priest did on that day and what Christ did. While the language is obscure, the intention is clear: in contrast to the annually repeated ritual, Christ entered the “Most Holy Place” once and for all, obtaining eternal redemption. The pericope concludes in vv. 13–14, contrasting the cleansing of conscience achieved under the new arrangements with the external cleansing achieved under the former arrangements.

Many scholars consider that the typological relationship between the two priests extends to the design of the respective sanctuaries, so that the sanctuary in heaven is understood to have both an outer court and a holy of holies where God dwells, with the implication that Jesus went “through” the outer court into the heavenly holy of holies (vv. 11–12).¹⁹⁶ This reading arises from understanding the heavenly temple as a structure in heaven, of which the tabernacle and temple are copies, with corresponding architectural detail, something extrapolated from Heb 8:5. In my discussion of that text, I argued that the words normally read as “copy and shadow” (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά) should be read as a “symbolic foreshadowing,” so that the temple is a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things—the new things that have come with Christ. Similarly, Schenck points out, “there seems little use for an outer tent in the heavenly sanctuary. It makes little sense to include things which are symbolic hindrances to God’s presence in a theology which has as its basic point the access of the perfected to God’s presence in the heavenly holy of holies.”¹⁹⁷ Accordingly, if the heavenly temple has no inner and outer tent, then the notion of Christ entering the inner tent “through” the outer tent is difficult to uphold.

In what follows I will argue that the expression “through the greater and more perfect tent” is to be understood instrumentally. He entered “by means of the greater and more perfect tent,” a metaphor for the new order that has

196 See, e.g. Attridge 1989: 245–47; Lane 1991b: 236–39; O’Brien 2010: 318–22.

197 Schenck 2007: 155. For a contrary view see Moffitt 2011: 220–25.

come with Christ, further specified as “not by means of animal blood,” but “by means of his own blood.”

The Flow of the Argument of Heb 9:1–10

In Heb 9:1 τὸ ἅγιον...κοσμικόν (singular, definite—“the earthly sanctuary”) refers to the two-part wilderness tabernacle. Hebrews 9:2–3 refer to “a tent” (σκηνή—singular, indefinite), called Ἅγια (“the Holy Place”),¹⁹⁸ and behind the second curtain another “tent” (σκηνή—singular, indefinite), called Ἅγια Ἁγίων (“the Most Holy Place”).¹⁹⁹ A brief description of the contents of each tent follows, followed in turn by a discussion of the activities of the former priests in this sanctuary. In v. 6 they are said to continually enter εἰς τὴν πρώτην σκηνήν (“into the first [outer] tent”), and in v. 7 the high priest is said to enter εἰς τὴν δευτέραν [σκηνήν] (“into the second [inner tent]”) annually on the Day of Atonement. Here present tense verbs describe these activities, daily in the first tent and annually in the second. These are probably gnomic presents referring to cultic activities carried on in the tabernacle once the arrangements described in vv. 1–5 were in place.²⁰⁰

Thus far, both parts of the sanctuary are described with the word σκηνή (“tent”), qualified with the ordinal numbers πρῶτος (“first”) and δεύτερος (“second”), the entire tabernacle is τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν (“the earthly sanctuary”),

198 NA²⁸ capitalises this nominative neuter plural indefinite noun indicating that it is a proper noun referring to the outer tent. Witnesses for this reading are the second reviser of D a number of minuscules and the Majority Text. It is also supported (without diacritical marks) in **Σ**, the first reviser of D, and I and P. Without an accent it could be a nominative feminine singular adjective (ἁγία), agreeing with σκηνή or πρόθεσις, see Swetnam 1970: 205–21. Codex Vaticanus (B) has τὰ ἅγια, making the neuter plural reading explicit. A well attested reading that Attridge 1989 considers to be original on the grounds that it is the *lectio difficilior* is ἁγία ἁγίων (“holy of holies”—P⁴⁶, A, the original hand of D and some Latin mss). The difficulty with this reading is that while it refers to the inner tent, the list of contents (v. 2) indicates a reference to the outer tent. The reading adopted by NA²⁸ is probably the best option, as the only other serious contender in terms of external evidence (ἁγία ἁγίων) is too difficult in the context.

199 This is the reading in NA²⁸, with capitalisation. It appears in the original hands of **Σ** and D, as well as A and I (*vid.*), plus some minuscules. The expression only appears here in the NT and there are a variety of other readings. The second revisers of **Σ** and D, and B, K, L and some minuscules add definite articles to both words (τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων) a possible assimilation to Lev 16:33, while P and one later witness add the definite article to ἁγίων (perhaps reflecting a *nomen regens* in a Hebrew Vorlage). P⁴⁶ reads ἀνά, probably an error for ἁγία.

200 Bruce 1990: 21 and Walker 1994: 58 seem to favour the view that the author writes “as if the ritual were still being enacted.”

the outer tent, Ἁγία (“Holy Place”), and the inner tent, Ἁγία Ἀγίων (“Holy of Holies”). But these verses contain an interesting semantic shift in respect of the terms πρῶτος and δεύτερος (“first” and “second”).²⁰¹ Both of these words appear in Heb 8:7 to refer to the first (former) and second (new) covenants, and πρῶτος appears again in 8:13 and 9:1 to describe the former covenant over against the new covenant of Jer 31:31–34, although the word διαθήκη (“covenant”) has to be supplied in both places. Here, the enumerators “first” and “second” have a temporal reference. The semantic shift occurs in 9:2–7, where they have a spatial reference, describing the outer (first) tent and inner (second) tent of the earthly sanctuary.

In Heb 9:8–10, the first tent (the antecedent of ὅστις, “which,” v. 9)²⁰² is said to be a παραβολή (“image or symbol”) “for the present time” (εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεσθηκότα, v. 9) by which the Holy Spirit indicates that μήπω πεφανερώσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσις (“the way into the sanctuary is not yet revealed, while the ‘first’ tent still has status”).²⁰³ A reader encountering v. 8 for the first time would infer that the existence of the first (outer) tent was a figurative explanation that the way into the holy of holies (τὰ ἅγια—in the tabernacle) was not yet visible.²⁰⁴

But when the reader reaches vv. 9–10 it becomes apparent that τὰ ἅγια (plural, definite) in v. 8 refers to the heavenly temple,²⁰⁵ the sense it had in 8:2 (the only previous occurrence of this form), leading to a suggestion that ἡ πρώτη σκηνή (“the first tent”) might also refer to the entire wilderness tabernacle, or perhaps the temple, given the blurring of the distinction between tabernacle and temple in 8:5.²⁰⁶ Thus, there is a *double entendre*, where the

201 I argue the following with greater detail in Church 2013b: 120–22.

202 In line with the way the relative pronoun ὅστις consistently refers to a preceding substantive in Hebrews (2:3; 8:5, 6; 9:2, 9, 10:8, 11, 35; 12:5; 13:7), I treat the antecedent here as ἡ πρώτη σκηνή (“the first tent”). See Young 1981: 200–201 and the standard commentaries, e.g. Attridge 1989: 241; O’Brien 2010: 313–14. Alternatively, it could refer to the entire state of affairs described in vv. 7–8, a reading adopted by Michel 1966: 22; Johnson 2006: 225; Thompson 2008: 184.

203 For the reading “has status” see Attridge 1989: 240 (note 127); Walker 1996: 209; Schenck 2007: 150, 153, who suggests that this may be an oblique reference to the readers’ tendency to give the former age and covenant more status than was warranted—including the temple.

204 Young 1981: 199.

205 Koester 1989: 158–59; Lane 1991b: 216 (the “real sanctuary,” see also Lane’s note r).

206 Cockerill 2012: 382 discounts this reading since the author “could hardly call an ‘earthly sanctuary’ the ‘First Tent’ since it did not precede the eternal heavenly sanctuary of which it was a copy.” But if, as I have just argued, Heb 8:5 is to be read as referring to the

author uses *πρῶτος* and *δεύτερος* both temporally and spatially, and *ἅγιος* and *σκηνή* for the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries, both as a whole and for their various parts.²⁰⁷

When read from the perspective of the design of the tabernacle, the way into the holy of holies is not visible (*φανερῶ*) while the outer tent surrounds it. When read from the perspective of the distinction between the former (earthly) and the eschatological (heavenly) sanctuaries, while the earthly sanctuary has normative status (*ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσις*),²⁰⁸ the way into the presence of God (*τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν*) is not apparent (*φανερῶ*).

The temporal expressions in vv. 8–9 make it clear that this is the case. The existence of the first (outer/former) tent is said to be a symbol “for the present time” (*εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*), according to which various “ineffective cultic rituals” (*δικαιώματα σαρκός*) are imposed “until the time of correction” (*μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως*). The understanding of these temporal expressions is complex, but clarified once it is recognised that they are two ways of referring to the same epoch: the present time (v. 9) is the time of correction (v. 10),²⁰⁹ the time of the new order, the inauguration of the eschaton that began with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God (Heb 1:1–3).

Consequently, these two verses enlarge on the expression *ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά* in Heb 8:5. There, the earthly sanctuary is said to be a symbolic foreshadowing of the heavenly things; here, the same earthly sanctuary is a parable pointing to the present time, when the heavenly things (the new order) have

the temple as “a symbolic foreshadowing” of the eschatological temple, then Cockerill’s objection evaporates.

207 Those who read *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή* (‘the first tent’) in v. 8 as a reference to the entire wilderness tabernacle include Moffatt 1924: 118; Spicq 1952: 2: 253–54; Bruce 1990: 208–9; Ellingworth 1993: 348. Those who read it as referring to the outer tent of the wilderness tabernacle as in vv. 2, 6, 8 include Young 1981: 200–201; Koester 2001: 396–97; Attridge 1989: 240; Lane 1991b: 223; Schenck 2007: 96–99; O’Brien 2010: 313; Cockerill 2012: 381–82. These argue that to see it in any other way involves too subtle a change in meaning from the definition in v. 2 and the same expression in v. 6, with both vv. 6 and 9 part of the same periodic sentence (vv. 6–10). I am arguing that the sense of *πρῶτος* in v. 8 is not either spatial or temporal, but both spatial and temporal, depending on how the entire sentence is read. For a *double entendre* in these verses see Stanley 1995: 395–96; Johnson 2006: 224. The *double entendre* also extends to the verb *φανερῶ*. For the new order as a means of access to the presence of God see Heb 7:19.

208 Attridge 1989: 250; Schenck 2007: 150, 53.

209 For this reading see, e.g. Loader 1981: 165; Attridge 1989: 240–42; Ellingworth 1993: 440–41; Mackie 2007: 223. Hofius 1972: 64; Young 1981: 201, and Lane 1991b: 224–25 see a contrast in line with standard rabbinic and apocalyptic Judaism—*עולם הזה* (“this age”) over against *הבא* *עולם* (“the age to come”).

arrived.²¹⁰ Hebrews 9:6–10 then presents a temporal/horizontal perspective on the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. While the earthly one had “normative status,” access to the heavenly sanctuary was not disclosed. Now that the new order has come, that status no longer applies and access to the presence of God (the heavenly sanctuary) is now disclosed. How that takes place is the subject of the following verses.

The Definitive Sacrifice of Christ (9:11–14)

Having made these claims about the earthly sanctuary and its relationship to the heavenly sanctuary the author turns to the self-offering of Christ. Verses 11–12 describe the “once and for all” (ἐφάπαξ) entrance of Christ “into the sanctuary” (εἰς τὰ ἅγια),²¹¹ and vv. 13–14 explain this by contrasting the sprinkling of animal blood in the tabernacle and temple with Christ’s offering of himself. But while there is clearly a contrast, the way the actions of Christ are described is different. The high priest enters “not without blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, 9:7). Christ enters “by means of” (διὰ) his own blood (9:11–12). And Christ neither offers nor sprinkles his blood (as did the high priest, 9:7).²¹² Rather, he offers himself (ἐαυτόν, 9:14) to God.

210 Ellingworth 1993: 444 notes that the author does not explicitly say that the former regulations no longer “remain in force after the new age is inaugurated.” While this is strictly true, as he also notes, “the strong implication is that they do not.” This implication is perhaps strongest in 8:13, see also 7:18–19.

211 This word (plural, definite) picks up the former uses of the same word (8:2; 9:8) and refers to the heavenly temple as a holy of holies. To this point I have avoided referring to the heavenly sanctuary as a “place,” reading rather it as a symbol for the dwelling of God with his people (in the eschaton). However, in Heb 9:11–14 the language of place is appropriate, since Christ is said to have “entered” the heavenly holy of holies. Nevertheless, I maintain that the text applies the symbolism of the Day of Atonement ritual (entrance into the holy of holies) to the death of Christ, interpreting his death as the antitype of both the slaughter of the sacrificial animals on the Day of Atonement and the aspersion of the animal blood in the holy of holies. The text does not envisage him entering the inner compartment of a heavenly temple to sprinkle his blood as the former high priest did in the earthly holy of holies.

212 When Jesus is the subject of προσφέρω in Hebrews, he offers prayers (5:7), himself (9:14, 25) and a single sacrifice for sins (10:12, see also 9:28 where, with the passive voice, Christ himself is offered), and 10:10, which refers to “the offering of his body” (τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Nowhere in Hebrews does he offer his “blood.” Young 1981: 207–8 notes that only in Heb 9:7 is προσφέρω used to refer to the aspersion of blood in the holy of holies. He also draws attention to the appearance of the same verb in 9:14, with a different direct object (ἐαυτόν). As he notes, in Heb 9 the self-offering of Christ (at Golgotha) is considered to correspond to the “offering” of the blood by the former high

Hebrews 9:11–12 is a single sentence with a main clause containing a subject (Christ), a verb (he entered) and an indirect object: Χριστός . . . εἰσῆλθεν . . . εἰς τὰ ἅγια (“Christ . . . entered . . . into the sanctuary”). The opening words (Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν, “but Christ having appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come”)²¹³ refer to the exaltation of Christ the high priest,²¹⁴ and the adversative δέ (“but”) at the beginning of v. 11 sets up a contrast with the previous sentence (vv. 6–10), which describes the former/outer tent as a symbol (παραβολή) pointing to the time of the correction, now come. The final clause (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος, “obtaining eternal redemption”) explains what Christ’s self-offering achieved. Embedded in this sentence are three adverbial clauses beginning with διὰ followed by a genitive (“through”), further qualifying the entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary. They read:

- (1) διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως (“through the greater and more perfect tent, that is not of this creation”)
- (2) οὐδὲ δι' αἱμάτων τράγων καὶ μόσχων (“not through the blood of bulls and goats”)
- (3) διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἱματος (“but through his own blood”)

priest in the earthly holy of holies. If we apply this reasoning to 9:11–12 it becomes clear that the entrance of Christ into the heavenly holy of holies is to be equated with his self-offering, that is his death, as two sides of the same event as Stegemann and Stegemann 2005: 14 propose.

213 There is a variant reading here, with **8**, **A**, the second reviser of **D**, **I** (*vid*), several minuscules, the Majority Text, part of the old Latin tradition, a marginal reading in one MS of the Syriac tradition, the Coptic tradition and Eusebius all reading μελλόντων (“about to come”). The text adopted by the editors of **NA**²⁸ is witnessed by **P**⁴⁶ (with minor differences), **B**, the original hand of **D**, 1739 and the Peshitta (with minor differences) and the Syriac witness Harklensis. The reading μελλόντων seems to have arisen through assimilation to Heb 10:1. The attestation of γενομένων is “superior . . . on the score of age and diversity of text type” (Metzger 1994: 598). See the discussion in Zuntz 1953: 119; Braun 1984: 265; Attridge 1989: 244; Bruce 1990: 211; Lane 1991b: 229; DeSilva 2000b: 303; Koester 2001: 407–8 all of whom prefer γενομένων.

214 The substantive ἀρχιερεὺς echoes Heb 8:1–2, and together with the participle παραγενόμενος refers to his exaltation as high priest to the right hand of God. Compare 1:4; 6:20; 7:26 where γενόμενος refers to Jesus “becoming a high priest” at his exaltation. See e.g. Attridge 1989: 245; Mackie 2007: 91. Westcott 1892: 255 sees a reference to the incarnation, as does Spicq 1952: 2: 256. Hebrews is written from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ rather than his birth.

The sense(s) of the preposition *διὰ* in these three clauses is debated. The second and third clauses are relatively straightforward. They describe the action of Christ with negative and positive statements, implicitly contrasting the action of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. That high priest entered “not without [animal] blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, 9:7); Christ entered not “*διὰ*” animal blood, but rather, “*διὰ*” “his own blood” (τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος).

Attridge argues that these clauses describe Christ entering the heavenly sanctuary “with” his blood, which presumably he offered to God, corresponding to the aspersion of blood on the cover of the Ark of the Covenant by the former high priest (9:7).²¹⁵ But the semantic range of the preposition *διὰ* does not seem to include the notion of accompaniment.²¹⁶ A more satisfactory reading is to take the *διὰ* instrumentally: Christ entered, not by means of animal blood, but by means of his own blood. And while the former high priest is said to “offer” (προσφέρω) animal blood in the holy of holies, Christ offers not his blood, but himself (9:14, 23–28), implying that τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Heb 9:12, 14 is to be understood as a figurative reference to his sacrificial death. Thus, “blood” is a metaphor for “death.”²¹⁷ It was by means of his death that he entered the sanctuary, not by means of the death of animals, as was the case with the former high priest on the Day of Atonement.

215 Attridge 1989: 248–51. Attridge is hesitant to press the imagery. See also DeSilva 2000b: 305, and Loader 1981: 167–68, who argues strongly for this reading, concluding that it “ist bei weitem die natürlichste, wenn man an die Handlung des Hohenpriesters denkt.” In a similar context, Heb 9:25 refers to the High Priest entering ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ (“with the blood of another”), but the corresponding statement describing the work of Christ there refers to him “having been offered” (ὁ Χριστὸς . . . προσεγενεχθείς). Moffitt 2011: 215–96 argues strongly that Jesus offered “his body, blood and self [before God in heaven . . . i.e. he] “presented himself before God, alive and in his glorified human body” (p. 296), arguing that it is in this sense that Jesus offers “his blood—his life before God *in heaven*.” I note that nowhere in Hebrews is Jesus said to offer “his blood” to God (see note 212, above).

216 BADG: 224–26 lists no case where *διὰ* has the sense of “with” (accompaniment). See the discussion in O’Brien 2010: 321–22. Plutarch (*Lives*, 17:2) refers to laws written “not with ink but with blood” (δὲ αἵματος, οὐ διὰ μέλανος). But this “with” is not accompaniment but instrumental (*LSJ* 389, s.v. *διὰ*, A. III. c.; *BDAG* 224, s.v. *διὰ*, A. 3).

217 *BDAG* 26–27, s.v. αἷμα, 2, b. See Behm 1964: 174–75; Young 1981: 207–9; Peterson 1982: 138; Bruce 1990: 213, 216–17; Lane 1991b: 238; Ellingworth 1993: 447, 452, 456; Joslin 2008: 230–31. αἷμα appears twenty-one times in Hebrews. It refers to animal blood offered to God under the former cultus in 9:7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25; 10:4; 11:28; 13:11. In 2:14 the expression αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ (“blood and flesh”) refers to what constitutes humanity. The shedding of blood is a metaphor for death in 12:4. In the remaining instances it is a metaphor for the death of Jesus (9:14; 10:19; 12:24; 13:11–12, 20). This is disputed by Moffitt 2011: 216–19.

Reading these two prepositions instrumentally is coherent. But what of the first preposition? Most scholars construe the *διὰ* in this clause locally, with Christ said to have gone through the “greater and more perfect tent” (the outer compartment of a two-part heavenly sanctuary) and entered the heavenly holy of holies (the inner compartment of this heavenly sanctuary).²¹⁸ This reading apparently describes the action of Christ in a way that corresponds to the action of the former high priest described in 9:7. A number of objections can be raised.

The first objection is related to the different way the actions of the two high priests are described. In 9:7 the former high priest enters “not without blood” (*οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος*) which he offers (*προσφέρω*) for himself and for the inadvertent sins of the people. But verse 11 takes pains not to say that Christ entered “with” or “without” blood, rather it is “by means of” (*διὰ*) blood. And he is nowhere said to offer his blood like the former high priest did; he offers himself (*ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν*) to God (9:14).

The next objection concerns the syntax of 9:11. The question must be asked whether the same preposition (*διὰ*) can have different senses (local and instrumental) in the same sentence, modifying the same verb. This is possible, but difficult.²¹⁹ Elsewhere in Hebrews, the same preposition occurs with different nuances in the same sentence,²²⁰ but in these cases the prepositions are construed with different verbs. Here, three adverbial clauses beginning with the same preposition modify the same verb and the reader is asked to read one of them in a different sense.

The third objection is that this reading assumes a two-part sanctuary in heaven corresponding in architectural detail to the earthly sanctuary, with an outer and an inner compartment. As mentioned above, Schenck notes the incongruity of a text which concerns itself with open access to God under the new covenant picturing this with architectural detail indicating that access to God is restricted as in the former tabernacle and the temple.²²¹ I have already argued that the heavenly temple is not to be understood in Hebrews as a heavenly archetype of the earthly sanctuary, corresponding in architectural detail.

218 See e.g. Spicq 1952: 2: 256; Hofius 1972: 67–68; Michel 1975: 310–11; Loader 1981: 166–68; Peterson 1982: 143–44; Thompson 2008: 186; Attridge 1989: 244–47; Lane 1991b: 237–38; Ellingworth 1993: 250–51; Mackie 2007: 90–93; O’Brien 2010: 320; Moffitt 2011: 221–25.

219 Young 1981: 203 thinks it is “extremely difficult, though not impossible;” Hofius 1972: 80–81 considers that it is possible, and Attridge 1989: 245 finds it “not unusual.” See also the discussion in Schenck 2007: 161.

220 Heb 1:7–8 (*πρός*); 5:1 (*ὑπέρ*); 7:25 (*εἰς*).

221 See footnote 197 (above).

Rather, it refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, the “temple” that God was expected to build in the last days.

The final objection is that the former high priest is nowhere, either in Leviticus or in Hebrews or elsewhere, ever said to “go through” the outer tent to reach the inner tent, suggesting that if Christ is considered to do this, it is additional (tautological) detail.²²²

None of these alone is decisive, but cumulatively they make a case for reading the *διά* in the first clause instrumentally:²²³ Christ entered “by means of the greater and more perfect tent,” although this reading is obscure and needs clarification.²²⁴

Clarification comes with another look at vv. 7–10. There, the former tent is understood as a “symbol” (*παραβολή*) pointing to the new order. The “greater and more perfect tent” (9:11) contrasts with this former tent and symbolises the new order itself.²²⁵ In support of this, I note the correspondence between the expression *ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνή οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως* (“the greater and more perfect tent not made with hands; that is not of this creation”) here and *ἡ σκηνή ἀληθινή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρώπος* (“the true tent, which the Lord has pitched and not a human”) in Heb 8:2. Both these expressions describe the heavenly sanctuary as a whole. The “greater and more perfect tent” symbolises the new order, and the next two adverbial clauses are expegetical. It is “by means of” the new order, that is, “by means of” the offering of himself and not “by means of” animal sacrifice, that Christ entered the heavenly realms, obtaining eternal redemption.²²⁶ Rather than

222 Young 1981: 203. The design of the tabernacle required this of the high priest, but it is assumed and never expressed.

223 For the instrumental sense of *διά* see BDAG 224, s.v. *διά*, 3. It has this sense in Heb 2:14; 6:11, 18; 7:19; 9:26; 10:10; 11:4, 7, 33, 39; 12:15, 28; 13:2, 12.

224 Chrysostom, recognising a correspondence between the first and the third *διά* clauses, argues that since the third refers to Christ’s blood, the first refers to his body with the metaphor “tent.” See Chrysostom *Hom. Heb.* xxxiv (PG 63.119, ET Schaff 1969). See also the discussion in Westcott 1892: 256–58. Son 2005 adopts the spatial reading of *διά* in Heb 9:11–12 because he thinks that an instrumental reading requires the tent to refer to the body of Christ, which he rightly recognises as alien to the context. *σκηνή* has the sense of “tabernacle” or “temple” throughout Hebrews (8:2, 5; 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 21; 13:10), apart from in 11:9 where it refers to the temporary dwellings of the patriarchs in the land of promise. The Pauline metaphor (2 Cor 5:1–4) appears nowhere in Hebrews; it is alien to the context and should be abandoned.

225 Hofius 1972: 66–67; Young 1981: 204–6.

226 Cf. Young 1981: 204–5, “[b]y means of the new order, not by means of animal sacrifices (as in the old order), but by means of his own blood (as in the new order) he entered

suggesting that Christ took his blood into the inner compartment of the heavenly temple, then, these verses describe the self-offering of Christ as the means by which he entered the sanctuary.

In conclusion then, as with 4:14; 7:26 and 8:2, there is no evidence in this text for a bicameral temple in heaven with the holy of holies concealed by a curtain within the holy place, which Christ passed through to enter the heavenly holy of holies to offer his blood to God. This text does not exploit the actions of the high priest on the Day of Atonement by drawing a distinction between two parts of the heavenly temple. Rather, the contrast is between the former, earthly tent and the eschatological, heavenly tent. The former, earthly tent (and by extension the temple) was a “symbol” (παράβολή, 9:8), or a “symbolic foreshadowing” (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά, 8:5) of the eschatological, heavenly tent. This is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come.

Covenant Inauguration (9:15–22)

This paragraph is central to the author’s argument, but is concerned with the high priestly service of Christ rather than temple symbolism *per se*. It is logically connected to v. 14 with καὶ διὰ τοῦτο (“and because of this”), and the following paragraph is logically connected by means of οὖν (“therefore”) in v. 23. A series of syntactical markers indicate the flow of the argument.²²⁷

Hebrews 9:15 signals a shift from the discussion of the Day of Atonement ceremony as a model for understanding the death of Christ, to a discussion of his death as the means of inaugurating the new covenant, something announced in passing in 7:22 and 8:7–13. This leads to a discussion of the theology of covenant making (vv. 16–17), explaining why it was necessary for Jesus to die for the new covenant to be inaugurated.²²⁸

the holy of holies (i.e. heaven itself, the presence of God, 9. 24) . . . The ‘greater and more perfect tent’ symbolizes the eschatologically new cultic means of access; the ἄγια is the ultimate goal of that access—the presence of God in heaven.”

227 Verses 16 and 17 begin with γάρ; v. 18 with ὅθεν indicating that what follows is deduced from what precedes; and v. 19 with γάρ. The remaining verses are connected to one another with καί.

228 Many scholars (e.g. Attridge 1989: 255; Bruce 1990 221–24; Ellingworth 1993: 462–63; Moffitt 2011: 291; Peeler 2014: 132) argue for a semantic shift in the word διαθήκη here from “covenant” to “(last) will (and testament),” arguing that the sentence is a description of how such a will is treated under Greco-Roman law. However, the tight flow of the argument from v. 15 to v. 22 makes an unannounced semantic shift like this unlikely and the supposed connections with the Greco-Roman law of testamentary dispositions have been shown to be tenuous (Hughes 1979b: 59–66; Hahn 2004: 416–36; 2005:

Verses 18–20 discuss the aspersion of blood on the people at the inauguration of the first covenant on Sinai (Exod 24:8), and lead into a discussion of the ceremony marking the inauguration of the tabernacle (vv. 21–22), when the “tent” (σκηνή) and “all the implements relating to the cult” (πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας) were sprinkled with blood. This signals a shift to a reference to the means of ritual cleansing by the aspersion of blood under the old covenant. In v. 22 this wider application is applied to the notion of ἄφεσις (“forgiveness”) by means of αἱματεκχυσία (“shedding of blood”),²²⁹ and an oblique reference to the death of Christ discussed in vv. 15–17 as the sacrifice inaugurating the new covenant, to be discussed more fully in 9:28; 10:1–18.

The Removal of Sin through the Sacrifice of Christ (9:23–28)

This pericope is said to contain language reflecting Philo and middle Platonism and a vertical and spatial contrast between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries.²³⁰ Here, the discussion of the cleansing of the former, earthly sanctuary with the sprinkling of the blood of animals (vv. 21–22) is contrasted with a description of the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ for the removal of sin.

Verse 23 claims that since τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“the symbols of the things in heaven”) had to be cleansed with “these” (τούτοις, “these rites,” as in 9:21–22), it was also necessary for αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (“the heavenly things themselves”) to be cleansed, but with better sacrifices, and verse 24 asserts that Christ did not enter a χειροποίητα ἅγια, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, (“a sanctuary

81–85). The pericope discusses the death of Christ, who took upon himself the curse of death on behalf of those who were subject to this curse for breaking the first covenant, thus freeing them from that curse (Hahn 2004: 435–36). Recent commentaries reading διαθήκη as “covenant” include Lane 1991b: 231 and O’Brien 2010: 329–31.

229 The word αἱματεκχυσία (“shedding of blood”) is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT and is absent from the LXX. It appears in later Christian writings, including Tatian, *Or. Graec.* 23; Epiphanius *Pan.* 39.9.2; Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* xvi who cites Heb 9:22. Behm 1964: 176–77 lists several other occurrences. A TLG search returned forty-nine occurrences, including Heb 9:22. Williamson 1970: 114 suggests that the author may have coined the word. Given the quotation of Exod 24:8 in v. 20, the author may have coined it as an echo of ἐγχείω αἷμα in Exod 24:6. As Hardin 2000: 114 explains the statement “without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins” is a statement about what happens under the Mosaic law. It is not a general statement of principle. See also Hughes 1979a: 88–89.

230 Sterling 2001: 198; Schenck 2003: 30; Johnson 2006: 243; Thompson 2008: 192–93.

made by hands, an antitype of the true one”), rather he entered αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν (“heaven itself”) to appear before the presence of God.²³¹

Verses 25–28 assert that Christ’s offering was not to be repeated like that of the former high priest who entered τὰ ἁγία (“the holy of holies”) annually “with the blood of another” (ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ), for such repetition would involve multiple repetitions of his sacrificial death. This cannot be, for he has appeared ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων (“once at the climax of history”) to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself, and will appear a second time to save those who wait for him.²³²

The language of 9:23–24 warrants a full discussion, but prior to this I refer in passing to vv. 25–28 and the appearance there of τὰ ἁγία (“the sanctuary,” v. 25). This expression has previously referred to the heavenly holy of holies that Christ entered (9:12), of which he is a minister (8:2; 9:8). Here it refers to the holy of holies in the earthly sanctuary.²³³ This also seems to be the case in Heb 13:11, an allusion to Lev 16:27,²³⁴ where the bodies of the animals sacrificed on the Day of Atonement are burnt outside the camp and their blood is “carried in” (εἰσφέρειν) “to the holy of holies” (εἰς τὰ ἁγία).²³⁵ This reference to the former Day of Atonement ceremony indicates that the discussion has reverted

231 Attridge 1989: 261, 263 and Sterling 2001: 198 consider that the use of the pronoun αὐτός with the sense of “itself” in these two verses reflects terminology used by Plato. While Plato may have used the word in this sense, e.g. *Prot.* 360E (αὐτὸ ἡ ἀρετή, “virtue itself”; *Parm.* 130B (αὕτη ὁμοιότης, “likeness itself”); 143A (αὐτὸ τὸ ἓν, “the one itself”); 150B (αὐτῆς σμοκρότῃς, “absolute smallness”); *Crat.* 411D (αὐτὸ ἡ νοῆσις, “intelligence itself”); *Resp.* 438C (ἐπιστήμη αὕτη, “knowledge itself”); 582A (αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, “the truth itself”); 612C (αὕτη δικαιοσύνη, “justice itself”); *Soph.* 256B (αὕτη κίνησις, “motion itself”), surely it is also well established in the NT and elsewhere, making the reference to Plato a case of special pleading. See BDAG 152–53. See e.g. Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42; 24:15; John 3:28; 4:44; Acts 24:15; Rom 15:14; 2 Cor 10:1; Heb 11:11. It appears in Josephus *J.W.* 5.207 to refer to the holy of holies in Herod’s temple, Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ναὸς κατὰ μέσον κείμενος, τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν . . . (“The shrine itself, found in the centre of the holy temple . . .”).

232 For the translation “climax of history” see Lane 1991b: 249. This is the “decisive final moment of history” (Attridge 1989: 264), related to ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (“in these last days”) in 1:2.

233 This is clarified by the second reviser of **8**, and a reading preserved in a few witnesses in the Sahidic tradition, which adds the genitive plural τῶν ἁγίων, perhaps assimilating this text to Heb 9:3.

234 See the marginal note in NA²⁸.

235 The text is not consistent, referring to the holy of holies, whether in the earthly or heavenly sanctuary as τὰ ἁγία (8:2; 9:8; 9:12; 9:25; 10:19; 13:11), ἁγία ἁγίων (9:3) or ἡ δευτέρα (σκηνή, 9:7).

to this from covenant inauguration rituals in vv. 15–22.²³⁶ Thus, v. 23 continues the discussion of covenant inauguration,²³⁷ and v. 24 marks a transition back to the discussion of the Day of Atonement.

Hebrews 9:23 compares and contrasts the purification rituals for τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“the symbols of the things in heaven”) and for αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (“the heavenly things themselves”).²³⁸ The expressions differ, but the differences are stylistic, and “the things in heaven” and “the heavenly things” have the same referent.²³⁹ Interpreters of Hebrews are unsure what these “heavenly things” are and why they would need to be cleansed. While “the symbols” (τὰ ὑποδείγματα) are the implements mentioned in v. 21,²⁴⁰ it is not at all certain that the text envisages a set of σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας (“implements of service”) in the heavenly sanctuary.²⁴¹ Rather, τὰ ἐπουράνια should be given the same general, non-specific sense as in 8:5, referring to the “heavenly things.”²⁴² As in 8:5, so also in 9:23 the details of the earthly sanctuary are seen as pointers to the heavenly realities that have now come in Christ.

236 O'Brien 2010: 338.

237 Hurst 1990: 38–39.

238 Hughes 1977 379; Attridge 1989: 260; Bruce 1990 227; Guthrie 1998: 308; Johnson 2006: 242–43; Thompson 2008: 192; O'Brien 2010: 336 all translate τὰ . . . ὑποδείγματα with “copies.” As in 8:5, Koester 2001: 417 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “representation” without clarifying the sense in which he is using the word. DeSilva 2000b: 311 translates the expression τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς with “the shadows of the realities in heaven,” which sounds like a translation of σκιά (“shadow”), which does not feature in these verses.

239 Koester 2001: 417 translates both τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τὰ ἐπουράνια with “the heavenly things.” Zerwick and Grosvenor 1979: 674 note that the terms are equivalent (and refer to the heavenly sanctuary).

240 Attridge 1989: 261; Ellingworth 1993: 475–76; O'Brien 2010: 336. Johnson 2006: 243 proposes that τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς refers to the heavenly sanctuary, so that the entire expression means “the copies of the heavenly sanctuary.” Not only does this mean assigning the sense “sanctuary” to the neuter plural genitive definite article τῶν standing alone, for which “things” is more appropriate, but it also suggests more than one earthly “copy” of the heavenly sanctuary. I have persevered with “symbols,” following my use of the term “symbolic foreshadowing” for ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in 8:5, which the word here recalls. Lane 1991b: 229 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “suggestions,” referring to Lee 1961: 167–69.

241 Contra McRay 1980: 6 who suggests that “the tabernacle and the church with their corresponding elements (table of showbread and Lord’s supper, laver and baptism, minora [sic] and Word of God, etc.) are antitypes of the reality in the heavens.”

242 She 2011: 171–74 argues that the “heavenly things” are a spatiotemporal, literal and physical sanctuary in heaven. This he claims is “the correct interpretation” of this text (p. 9).

That heavenly things need to be “purified” (καθαρίζω) has long caused consternation to interpreters of Hebrews.²⁴³ But it is only difficult if the heavenly things are equated with a heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly sanctuary is a “copy.” If the heavenly things are the good things that have come with the exaltation of Christ, that is, the new order of things, the difficulty evaporates. As in 8:5–6, the “heavenly things” are the better promises and the better covenant through which forgiveness and purification comes. Verse 23, then, is commentary on vv. 8–10, 11–14, which refer on the one hand to the inability of the former cultic arrangements to provide the forgiveness available under the new covenant, and on the other hand the purification from sins that comes from the self-offering of Christ, first hinted at in 1:3 with the noun καθαρισμός (“purification”).²⁴⁴

Hebrews 9:24 begins with γάρ, indicating that it explains in some way the statements in 9:23 about the cleansing of the heavenly things with better sacrifices. Here, the symbols of the heavenly things are described with two synonymous expressions: a “hand-made sanctuary” (χειροποίητα . . . ἅγια)²⁴⁵ and “antitype of the true one” (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν).²⁴⁶ This he did not enter. What he did enter, “heaven itself” (αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν) is contrasted with the earthly sanctuary. The words χειροποίητος, ἀληθινή and οὐρανός form an inclusio

243 A recent discussion is in O'Brien 2010: 336–38, who classifies the readings into three groups. Some refer to the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary, with καθαρίζω read as a purported synonym of ἐγκατατίθω (“to inaugurate,” v. 18, see Spicq 1952: 2: 267; Buchanan 1972: 153; Hurst 1990: 38–39; Dunnill 1992: 232; Ellingworth 1993: 477; Moffitt 2011: 225–26, note 20). Others refer to the purification of heaven itself, as though sin had caused celestial defilement (Delitzsch 1868: 2: 125; Moffatt 1924: 132; Johnsson 1973: 256–61; Lane 1991b: 247; Cockerill 2001: 192, note 50; Koester 2001: 421). Others refer to the cleansing of God's people (Attridge 1989: 261–62; Loader 1981: 169–70; Bruce 1990: 228–29). There are variations on this with Bruce referring to the heavenly things as the people of God, and Attridge the human conscience. Attridge 1989: 261–62; Ellingworth 1993: 477 have extensive discussions.

244 This reading is close to those readings that refer to the cleansing of humanity by providing forgiveness.

245 While ἅγια without the definite article could be explained with reference to the only other appearance of the word in this form in 9:2 where it is evidently a proper noun, here the indefiniteness indicates that the text refers to it simply as “a holy place.” Rissi 1987: 38–39 considers that anarthrous ἅγια here refers to the entire heavenly sanctuary in general, as opposed to the heavenly holy of holies, but attention to the syntax of the sentence shows that it is actually a reference to the earthly sanctuary as a member of the class of holy places, into which Christ did not enter.

246 Ἀντίτυπα is a neuter plural adjective, agreeing with ἅγια, a collective noun referring to “a sanctuary.” It needs to be rendered into English in the singular.

with 8:1–2,²⁴⁷ where the high priest is said to have sat down at the right hand of the Majesty “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), a “minister of the sanctuary, the true tent which the Lord has pitched and not a human” (τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος). Thus, this verse and those that follow round off the section extending from 8:1–9:28.

The expression ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν contains the only instance of ἀντίτυπος in Hebrews, although its counterpart τύπος appears in the quotation of Exod 25:40 in Heb 8:5 to refer to the “pattern” (Heb תבנית, Greek τύπος) Moses saw on the mountain, whether a model of the eschatological dwelling place of God, or that dwelling place itself. But what of ἀντίτυπος?²⁴⁸ The sense of this word can be clarified with reference to its other NT appearance in 1 Pet 3:21. While the interpretation of 1 Pet 3:21 continues to be debated,²⁴⁹ it does seem clear that it explains a correspondence between salvific events in the past and Christian baptism in the present, and that the ἀντίτυπος (“baptism”) comes after the τύπος (“the flood”),²⁵⁰ and ἀντίτυπος has a temporal sense: Christian baptism clarifies the deeper meaning of the waters of the flood.²⁵¹

It is sometimes claimed that in Heb 9:24 ἀντίτυπος here has a quite different sense from that in 1 Pet 3:21,²⁵² and refers to the earthly sanctuary as

247 Attridge 1989: 262–62; Lane 1991b: 248; Koester 2001: 421 consider that χειροποίητος is used pejoratively here, but that need not be so. Rather, it simply distinguishes the two sanctuaries, as does the similar expression in 8:2. The word is pejorative in Acts 7:48, referring to the temple as distinct from the wilderness tabernacle (see Acts 7:44); and 17:24 where it refers to idolatrous temples.

248 Woollcombe 1957: 64 proposes that τύπος and ἀντίτυπος are synonymous in Hebrews, both referring to the secondary nature of Moses’ tent. He comments, “The author’s purpose in quoting Ex. 25:40 was to show that Moses’ tent was at best a τύπος.” But Moses did not build a τύπος; he built a tabernacle based on a τύπος.

249 See the discussion in Goppelt 1978: 266–67; Michaels 1988: 214; Achtemeier 1996: 266–67; Davids 1990: 143; Elliott 2000: 668–72.

250 See the discussion of ἀντίτυπος in Selwyn 1961: 298–99, who refers to Melito of Sardis (*Homily on the Passion*, 36–37) in connection with Heb 9:24 comparing the “Law and the institutions of the old dispensation to a sculptor’s cast or pattern . . . [which] when the task is completed is discarded as of no value.” For the text in Melito see Hall 1979: 19–21 (lines 224–76).

251 Fritsch 1966: 100–101.

252 See Davidson 1981: 361–63. Davidson reads the τύπος seen by Moses either as the heavenly sanctuary itself, a model of it, or both, and argues that the τύπος was a model and the ἀντίτυπος corresponds to it. On this understanding, the heavenly sanctuary is the τύπος and the wilderness shrine the corresponding ἀντίτυπος, and the imagery is spatial and vertical.

"a (*mere*) copy of the true (sanctuary)."²⁵³ Thus, it is given spatial and vertical connotations, whereby the relationship between the wilderness sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary is expressed as a relationship between a superior archetype and its inferior copy.²⁵⁴ It is preferable, however, to recognise from the causal relationship of vv. 23, 24 that "the antitype of the true things" (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, v. 24) explains in some way the symbols of the things in heaven (τὰ . . . ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, v. 23). Consequently, the antitype of the true things and the symbols of the things in heaven are different, but complementary, ways of describing the wilderness shrine, leading to the conclusion that ἀντίτυπος and ὑπόδειγμα are "virtual synonyms."²⁵⁵ And, if so, since ὑπόδειγμα does not have the sense of "copy" neither does ἀντίτυπος.²⁵⁶

Rather than referring to the hand-made sanctuary as a "copy" of the true one, it is rather a "*prefiguration*" of the heavenly one.²⁵⁷ Thus, ἀντίτυπος here is only obliquely related to τύπος in Heb 8:5. It is used in the same way as in 1 Pet 3:21 and also as τύπος is used in Paul to indicate a "perceived

253 BDAG 90 (*italics original*). BDAG does cite Hurst 1983: 165–68, who argues that the word is used in the same sense as in 1 Pet 3:21 (with which BDAG seems to disagree). Sowers 1965: 90 (note 3) also wonders how certain it is that the word is used differently in 1 Peter and Hebrews. The discussion of the use of ἀντίτυπος in classical Greek in Hurst 1990: 17–19 is valuable, showing that "copy" is an option for this word. Nevertheless, he also shows "copy" does not give the most coherent reading of Heb 9:23–24. Elliott 2000: 670 notes that τύπος and ἀντίτυπος "when used independently . . . can [both] denote either something original or its copy, with its actual meaning determined by its context." See *LSJ* 165, 1835.

254 This reading of Heb 9:24 is assumed by Michaels 1988:214; Achtemeier 1996: 267; Elliott 2000: 670; Hanson 2002: 167 in their treatment of 1 Pet 3:21, all of whom suggest that this text and Heb 9:24 have little in common. Those who read Heb 9:24 along these lines include Attridge 1989: 262–63; Ellingworth 1993: 479; DeSilva 2000b: 313; Sterling 2001: 198; Koester 2001: 421; Johnson 2006: 243; Thompson 2008: 192; O'Brien 2010: 338. Philo uses ἀντίτυπος three times (*Plant.* 133; *Conf.* 102; *Her.* 181) and never with the sense of an inferior copy of a superior archetype. Rather, in Philo and in a variant reading in LXX Esth B 4 (see the Critical Apparatus in Hanhart 1983: 154) it has the sense of "inimical" or "resistant" (Hurst 1983: 165).

255 Davidson 1981: 361.

256 Hurst 1990: 17–19.

257 *Ibid.*: 18 (*italics original*). Bruce 1990: 230 calls the earthly sanctuary and its associated priestly service "faint foreshadowings" of the heavenly priestly service of Christ. Lane 1991b: 248 considers that the comparison here "reflects upon the typological relation between the old and new covenants."

correspondence between events of the sacred past and the present and some assured continuity between God's action in the past, present and future."²⁵⁸

The Foreshadowing of the Good Things to Come (10:1)

Hebrews 10:1–18 completes the arguments about the high priesthood of Jesus and his priestly work. It summarises 8:1–9:23, introduces some OT texts and draws out some of the implications.²⁵⁹ It comprises four paragraphs, each concluding with a categorical declaration. Verses 1–4 conclude that the blood of bulls and goats offered repeatedly cannot remove sin (v. 4); vv. 5–10 establish from Ps 40:6–8 (LXX 39:7–9) that Christ's offering of himself has abolished the former sacrifices; vv. 11–14 cite Ps 110:1 for the third time in Hebrews, including (for the first time) the line about the one seated waiting for the subjugation of his enemies, and conclude with the claim that Christ, by his single sacrifice has perfected forever the sanctified ones (v. 14); and vv. 15–18 pick up Jer 31:33–34, previously cited in Heb 8, and conclude that the claim of Jeremiah, that God will no longer remember the sins and lawless deeds of his people, means that forgiveness has been achieved. There is, therefore, no further need for an offering for sin (v. 18).

The accumulation of words related to “offering” (προσφέρω, vv. 1, 2, 8, 11, 12; προσφορά, vv. 5, 8, 10, 14, 18); “sacrifice” (θυσία, vv. 1, 5, 8, 11, 12), “perfection” (τελειόω, vv. 1, 14); and “sin” (ἁμαρτία, vv. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 18) indicate the topic under discussion. These verses are about the inability of the sacrifices of the former covenant to achieve forgiveness, and the forgiveness now available for the people of God by Christ's unique offering of himself.²⁶⁰ I am concerned with vv. 1–4 and, in particular, the language of shadow and reality in v. 1.

Hebrews 10:1–4 is a single sentence that begins with a causal participial clause: the reason why “the law” (ὁ νόμος) cannot make perfect those who approach God is because it “possesses” (ἔχω)²⁶¹ a “shadow” (σκιὰ) of “the good

258 Elliott 2000: 670. For τύπος in Paul see Rom 5:14; 6:17; 1 Cor 10:6; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 4:12; Tit 2:7.

259 Attridge 1989: 268.

260 See the discussion of the form, structure and purpose of this section in Lane 1991b 257–59; Ellingworth 1993: 488–90; Joslin 2008: 238; O'Brien 2010: 343–44.

261 Joslin 2008: 244–45 explains the significance of the use of the verb ἔχω in this context. The author is not arguing that the law *per se* has been abolished, rather, he is arguing for the end of the former cultus. It is this cultus, especially the tabernacle, priesthood and associated rituals, that constitute the shadow that the law possesses (Grässer 1990–97: 49). The text is similar to Col 2:16–17 where food and drink, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths foreshadow what is to come. Those who read Heb 10:1 as though the law itself “was” a shadow have to extrapolate that ὁ νόμος (“the law”) is a shorthand expression for

things to come" (τὰ μελλόντα ἀγαθά), and not "the image itself" (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) of "the realities" (τὰ πράγματα). Indeed, they would have ceased being offered if they could make these people perfect, and since they have not, it is clear that these sacrifices (the blood of bulls and goats) cannot remove sins.²⁶²

The words "shadow" (σκιὰ), "image" (εἰκών) and "reality" (πράγμα) have led some readers of Hebrews to understand this text in terms of middle Platonism.²⁶³ To be sure the claims of influence from Plato and Philo are often muted,²⁶⁴ with the suggestion that the similarities are superficial and, indeed, Mackie has demonstrated this to be the case.²⁶⁵ It would be a diversion to examine the use of these three words in Philo, since this study is concerned with the exegesis of Hebrews rather than of Philo.²⁶⁶ I simply examine their use in Hebrews

-
- the cultic provisions of the former covenant (e.g. Bruce 1990: 234–35; Lane 1991b: 259; Ellingworth 1993: 490; O'Brien 2010: 344–45). The NIV and NRSV insert the word "only" into the text, and the NIV reads "the law is only a shadow." Guthrie 1998: 326 (based on the NIV) refers to "shadow" in Heb 8:5 and then suggests that "the law's sacrificial system can only be seen as an imperfect copy . . . that . . . mimics enough of the original to point God's people to greater, heavenly realities." Guthrie apparently reads "shadow" (σκιὰ) in this verse as "copy" (presumably ὑποδείγμα, 8:5). I argue below that this text claims that the earthly cultus "foreshadows" (σκιὰ) the blessings of the new covenant.
- 262 In chapter 1 (above) I argue that this text is evidence that Hebrews was written while the temple was still standing, and that Heb 10:11–12 refers to service in the temple when Hebrews was written.
- 263 E.g. Thompson 1982: 160; 2008: 194; Attridge 1989: 271; Weiss 1991: 502–3; Grässer 1990–97: 2: 206–7; Sterling 2001: 198–99; Schenck 2002: 131–32; Johnson 2006: 249.
- 264 E.g. Thompson 2008: 194, one of the most ardent supporters over the last forty years of the influence of middle Platonism on Hebrews, suggests that the author here "is not consistently Platonic . . . [but] is also making the familiar eschatological contrast between the two ages." Similarly, Sterling 2001: 199 finds it "striking . . . that Platonic language has been given a temporal thrust." Attridge 1989: 271 suggests that in Hebrews the use of Platonic language is "playfully rhetorical . . . [and] applied to a horizontal or temporal dichotomy that is quite foreign to the philosophical tradition, yet the significance of the Platonic conceptual framework has not been lost."
- 265 Mackie 2007: 105–20. Other works denying any more than a superficial contact with Platonism include Manson 1951: 184; Williamson 1963: 421; 1970: 566–67; Peterson 1982: 144–45; Wilson 1987: 170; Lane 1991b: 259–60; Schenck 2007: 119–20; O'Brien 2010: 345.
- 266 See the brief surveys in Mackie 2007: 108–11; Joslin 2008: 245–47. Mackie 2007: 110–11 concludes that for Philo σκιὰ "continues to represent physical objects in the sense—perceptible world" (*Leg.* 3.96–103; *Post.* 112–119; *Deus* 177; *Plant.* 27; *Somn.* 1.206; *Abr.* 119–120; *Flacc.* 165; *Legat.* 320); εἰκών "is a reflection or copy in a lower realm of something belonging to a higher realm" (Tobin 1983: 64–65), see *Opif.* 146; *Plant.* 50; *Sobr.* 132–134; *Migr.* 40; *Her.* 187; *Fug.* 12; *Mos.* 2.51, 267; *Spec.* 2.237; 4.146). At times these two terms are juxtaposed and appear as near synonyms (*Leg.* 3.96); and πρᾶγμα is used in a general sense for

to indicate that as opposed to Philo who uses them with spatial connotations, Heb 10:1 reflects not a spatial contrast but, in accord with 8:1–9:28, a temporal contrast. The contrast is between the inability of the former cultus to achieve forgiveness, something now possible with the abolition of that cultus with Christ's offering of himself (Heb 10:9).

"The coming good things" (τὰ μελλόντα ἀγαθά) are said to be "the realities" (τὰ πράγματα),²⁶⁷ of which the law possesses "a shadow" (σκιὰ) and not "the form itself" (αὐτὴ ἢ εἰκὼν).²⁶⁸ The text contrasts the shadow of the good things to come with the good things themselves.²⁶⁹ In the context of the entire paragraph, these good things are the self-offering of Christ inaugurating the better covenant based on the better promises (vv. 5–6), the removal of sins that the former sacrifices could not achieve (v. 4); the ability to "perfect" (τελειόω) those who approach,²⁷⁰ which the former cultus was unable to achieve (vv. 2, 14), "our" sanctification (v. 10); and the forgiveness of sins (v. 18).²⁷¹

Opposing these good things is their shadow, not their form itself. The word for "shadow" (σκιὰ) in an emphatic position at the start of the verse represents the key point at issue.²⁷² In my discussion of Heb 8:5 earlier in this chapter I noted that the juxtaposition in Heb 10:1 of σκιὰ and τὰ μέλλοντα ("the coming things") indicates that the sense of this word here is "foreshadowing,"²⁷³ the sense it also has in Heb 8:5 where it is coupled with ὑπόδειγμα. This is consistent

"matter, thing," although at times it is a synonym of εἰκὼν to refer to "the truly real things" (*Det.* 87; *Somn.* 2.115–116; *Prob.* 62; *Flacc.* 41). Philo uses σκιὰ fifty-two times; εἰκὼν one hundred and eighteen times; and πρᾶγμα four hundred and nineteen times.

267 The word πρᾶγμα appears three times in Hebrews. In 6:18 it is "two unchangeable things," the promise and the oath, and in 11:1 it is the assurance of things that are hoped for. Here, it is in apposition to the good "things" to come.

268 Mitchell 2007: 198–99 translates this expression "the same form," but that would be ἡ αὐτὴ εἰκὼν. He also mistakenly reads this verse as "the earthly sanctuary does not adequately reflect the heavenly."

269 In P⁴⁶ καὶ replaces οὐκ αὐτήν, giving the sense that the law possesses a shadow of good things *and* the image of the realities. On this reading "shadow" and "image" are synonyms. The reading cannot be original since the entire sentence (vv. 1–4) implies a contrast between the law and the good things, see Metzger 1994: 599–600; Lane 1991b: 254, note b; Mackie 2007: 114.

270 Cf. Heb 7:19; 9:9.

271 Peterson 1982: 145; Wilson 1987: 171; Bruce 1990: 235; Lane 1991b: 260; Koester 2001: 430.

272 Lane 1991b: 254, note a.

273 Barrett 1954: 386; Williamson 1970: 566; Lane 1991b: 253; O'Brien 2010: 345. Cf. Col 2:17.

with the temporal relationship between earthly sanctuaries and the eschatological sanctuary.²⁷⁴

Given this sense of “foreshadowing,” the text simply claims that while the law possesses the foreshadowing of these things, it does “not” (οὐκ, 10:1) possess “the image itself” (αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκών) of the things. Here, εἰκών is contrasted with σκιά. The σκιά is a foreshadowing; the εἰκών is the “actual manifestation” or “embodiment” of the good things,²⁷⁵ or their “true form.”²⁷⁶ The language might sound Platonic, but the contrast is a straightforward “then and now” contrast rather than “above and below.”

Hebrews 10:1 claims that the good things that have come with the self-offering and exaltation of Christ were foreshadowed in the former cultus, and that the former cultus was not the true form of these good things. This former cultus was a valid foreshadowing of the good things that were to come with Christ, but its fundamental design was such that it could not achieve what it foreshadowed, and now that the reality it foreshadowed has arrived, it is abolished (10:9).

This sentence accords with all that precedes it. The former cultus anticipated and pointed to the heavenly good things that were to come. These have now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God at the climax of the age (9:26), inaugurating the last days (1:2) with its blessings.

Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that the eschatological orientation of Heb 1:1–4:13; 10:26–13:25 also applies to Heb 4:14–10:25. In these chapters the heavenly sanctuary is not a structure in heaven of which the earthly sanctuary is a copy, rather it is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, now made available, proleptically, to the people of God. Thus, the vertical and spatial imagery in this part of Hebrews is secondary to the horizontal and temporal imagery.

²⁷⁴ As Wilson 1987: 171; Attridge 1989: 269; Mackie 2007: 106 note, while in 9:11 the good things have already come (τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν), here they are still to come. The distinction is a matter of perspective: from the perspective of the former cultus, the good things are still to come (10:1); from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ, the good things have come (9:11).

²⁷⁵ O'Brien 2010: 345. Cf. also Kleinknecht 1964: 389, “εἰκών does not imply a weakening or a feeble copy of something. It implies the illumination of its inner core and essence.”

²⁷⁶ Flender 1976: 288. Spicq 1952: 1: 75 compares the relationship of σκιά to εἰκών to an artist's preliminary sketch and his completed masterpiece.

The author claims that the turn of the ages took place with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. This decisive event indicated the end of the former covenant with its sanctuary and ritual, so much so that this ritual and this sanctuary no longer had the normative status it had in the past. It was a symbol prefiguring the new order that came with the exaltation of Christ. This symbolic function gave it its validity. It was intended to point to the eschaton, which it did, and now that the eschaton has come it has reached its *telos* and is no longer normative. It has grown old and is close to destruction (8:13), and the good things have now come (9:11).

Hebrews is more about salvation history than cosmology. The influence of middle Platonic cosmology reflected in Philo has had an undue influence on modern day readers of Hebrews, leading to the continuing imposition of the ideas of Philo onto the text. It is this that continues to lead interpreters to interpret such words as ὑπόδειγμα and ἀντίτυπος in ways that make the author's secondary concern with cosmology primary, and relegate his primary concern, the decisive change brought about with the death and subsequent exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, to something secondary.

Conclusion

This study is an examination of the temple symbolism and the attitude to the temple in Hebrews in the light of temple symbolism and attitudes to the temple in the literature of Second Temple Judaism outside of Hebrews. I have argued that in Hebrews the heavenly temple is not an eternal heavenly archetype of which the wilderness tabernacle is a copy. Rather, the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon's temple and the Second Temple still standing in Jerusalem prefigured the heavenly temple, which is to be understood as the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. Christ the exalted Son of God is now crowned with glory and honour in the world to come. Ultimately, that world, also referred to as God's rest, the heavenly Jerusalem, the city with foundations, the city of the living God, the unshakeable kingdom and the city to come, will be made subject to humanity, with God's original purpose that humans made in God's image should have dominion over the creation coming to fruition.¹

Several themes emerged from my study of the literature of Second Temple Judaism that have a bearing on the understanding of the temple symbolism in Hebrews. First, some readers of Hebrews, noting that the Jerusalem temple never appears in the book, have argued that the author has no interest in this temple. However, arguments from the silence of Hebrews on the topic of the Second Temple cannot be used to argue that the author had no interest in the temple and the cult. In literature evidencing a sense of dissatisfaction with the Second Temple, the temple is also often ignored, being passed over in silence. I have argued here and elsewhere that in parts of Hebrews there is a strong polemic against the temple.² This polemic is on quite different grounds, however. In the other literature the temple and/or the priesthood were corrupt; in Hebrews the tabernacle, temple and priesthood were formerly valid as the dwelling place of God and as the means of access to God. With the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God the eschatological realities they foreshadowed have now come into the present, and the anticipatory symbols are to be left behind.

1 In a forthcoming publication (Church 2017) I argue that such dominion is not domination, but rather humans are called to "foster the conditions for all creatures, human and non-human alike, to live and flourish under God."

2 See also Church 2013b: 109–28.

Secondly, many readers of Hebrews suggest that the author views the wilderness tabernacle as a mere copy of an archetypal heavenly temple. Four things can be said about this. First, my discussion of Heb 8:5, in particular, has shown that this text more likely refers to the Second Temple standing in Jerusalem than to the wilderness tabernacle. Secondly, this is untenable on lexical grounds; the words ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά simply do not have the sense (“copy and shadow”) in which they are often read. Thirdly, wherever the wilderness tabernacle appears in the literature of the Second Temple period it is seen in a positive light, being based on the design God showed to Moses on Sinai, which gave it considerable prestige. The author of Hebrews shares this perspective. Fourthly, this reading has most often been based on perceived allusions to Philo and middle Platonism in Hebrews. But this approach does justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews. Rather than the imagery of a heavenly archetype and an earthly copy, Philo sees the temple or tabernacle as a microcosm of the universe. When Philo does speak in terms of “copy,” he describes the tabernacle as a copy of a noumenal “idea” existing in the mind of God. That Jesus or the people of God could have access to this “idea” would be unthinkable to Philo.

Thirdly, many readers of Hebrews argue, especially from Heb 9:11–12, that Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary with his own blood, which he offered to God, in a manner corresponding to the aspersion of blood in the holy of holies by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. Not only have I argued that this reading cannot be justified exegetically, it also presupposes a notion of some sort of blood sacrifice in heaven. The notion of blood sacrifice in heaven is absent from the literature of Second Temple Judaism, apart from the Qumran Sabbath Songs where the word זִבַּח appears along with other cultic terms. But even there it is not at all clear that the text envisages blood sacrifice in heaven. On this evidence it seems unlikely that the author of Hebrews would have entertained this notion.

On the other hand, several texts anticipate an eschatological temple that God will prepare, and in which God will dwell with his people in the last days. In most of the texts it is envisaged as an earthly structure, sometimes of gigantic proportions. In several texts, the community itself is seen as an interim temple awaiting this eschatological temple. It is this model that I find reflected in Hebrews, with significant modifications. Hebrews is written from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, in the world to come, in “these” last days (Heb 1:2). For Hebrews, the eschaton has come into the present, and the eschatological temple where God will dwell with his people is in place. Christ is enthroned in this temple, and the people of God have proleptic access to it from their location somewhere in the first century Mediterranean Diaspora. They also anticipate their ultimate goal, sharing in God’s rest in this

temple in the heavenly Jerusalem. That this is the case shows that the dualism in Hebrews is more eschatological than spatial, with the former sanctuaries and their associated cultus prefiguring the eschatological temple, now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.³ This eschatological temple is not a structure, either in heaven or on earth. Rather, it is a metaphor for the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

This has implications for the reading of Hebrews. The traditional view of Hebrews, the so-called relapse theory, supposes that the readers were tempted to relapse from Christianity to Judaism. But to speak of two religions, Judaism and Christianity, at the time Hebrews is thought to be written is anachronistic. However, some form of a modified relapse theory seems to be a reasonable position to take, especially in the light of Heb 13, where the author calls his readers away from involvement in ritual meals. He does not call them to abandon these for another religion, rather they are to follow Jesus whose sacrifice the former cultus anticipated. Now that the eschaton has arrived with the exaltation of Jesus, the former cultus has reached its *telos* and no longer has normative status. But this is not another religion. It is the arrival of the eschaton and the inauguration of the eschatological temple of which the Scriptures spoke. The author reads these Scriptures from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ, through whom God has spoken definitively to his people. God, who formerly spoke to "the ancestors" through the prophets, has now spoken to "us" through the exalted Son.

3 Of course, spatial and eschatological concerns are not mutually exclusive. Christ has been exalted "to the heights" (1:3). What I am arguing is that his exaltation signals for the author of Hebrews that the eschaton has arrived, and he encourages his readers to persevere so as to attain to the eschatological temple where Christ is enthroned, an eschatological temple that God's earthly dwelling places, tabernacle and temple prefigured.

Bibliography

- Aalen, Sverre (1961–62). “‘Reign’ and ‘House’ in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels.” *NTS* 8: 215–40.
- Abegg, Martin G. (1999). “Does Anyone Really Know what Time it is: A Reexamination of 4Q503 in Light of 4Q317.” In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D. W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill: 396–406.
- Abegg, Martin G. (2003). “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarrians.” In *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. JSJSup 71. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature: 81–97.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. (1996). *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Adams, Edward (2007). *The Stars Will Fall from Heaven: Cosmic Catastrophe in the New Testament and its World*. LNTS 247. London: T&T Clark.
- Adams, Edward (2009). “The Cosmology of Hebrews.” In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 122–39.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw (2005). “Portraying the Temple in Stone and Text: The Arch of Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews.” In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 131–48.
- Albl, Martin C. (1999). “*And Scripture Cannot be Broken*”: *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. NovTSup 46. Leiden: Brill.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1988). “Retelling the Old Testament.” In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars S.S.F.* Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 99–121.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1996). “The Redaction-History of *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal.” *RevQ* 17: 437–56.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1997). “‘Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places’: Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community.” In *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. JSPSup 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 318–37.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1998). “From Son of Adam to Second God.” In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International: 87–122.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1999). “The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 1: 331–53.

- Alexander, Philip S. (2006). *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*. LSTS 61. London: Continuum.
- Allegro, J. M. (1956). "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75: 174–87.
- Allegro, J. M. (1958). "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim." *JBL* 77: 350–54.
- Allegro, J. M. (1968). *Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD v. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Allen, David L. (2010). *Hebrews*. NAC 35. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Allen, David M. (2008). *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews: A Study in Narrative Re-presentation*. WUNT 2, 238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. (1988). "The Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *RevQ* 13: 189–97.
- Andersen, Francis I. (1983). "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 91–213.
- Andersen, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman (2000). *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 24E. New York: Doubleday.
- Anderson, David R. (2001). *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*. StBibLit 21. New York: Lang.
- Anderson, Gary A. (1989). "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden." *HTR* 82: 121–48.
- Anderson, Gary A. (2008). "To See Where God Dwells: The Tabernacle, the Temple, and the Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition." *Letter and Spirit* 4: 13–45.
- Anderson, Gary A. (2009). "Towards a Theology of the Tabernacle and its Furniture." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*. Edited by Ruth Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill: 161–94.
- Andreasen, Niels-Erik A. (1972). *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation*. SBLDS 7. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Andrews, H. T. (1913). "Epistle of Aristéas." *APOT* 2: 83–122.
- Andriessen, Paul C. B. (1976). "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14B–III 2." *NovT* 18: 293–313.
- Andriessen, Paul C. B. and A. Lenglet (1970). "Quelques passages difficiles de l'Épître aux Hébreux." *Bib* 51: 207–20.
- Arowele, P. J. (1990). "The Pilgrim People of God (An African's Reflections on the Motif of Sojourn in the Epistle to the Hebrews)." *AJT* 4: 438–55.
- Assefa, Daniel (2010). "Dreams, Book of (1 Enoch 83–90)." *DEJ* 552–53.
- Attridge, Harold W. (1976). *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. HDR 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

- Attridge, Harold W. (1980). "'Let us Strive to Enter that Rest': the Logic of Hebrews 4:1–11." *HTR* 73: 279–88.
- Attridge, Harold W. (1984). "Josephus and His Works." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 185–232.
- Attridge, Harold W. (1989). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Attridge, Harold W. (1990). "Paraenesis in a Homily (λόγος παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the 'Epistle to the Hebrews.'" *Semeia* 50: 211–26.
- Auffret, Pierre (1979). "Note sur la structure littéraire d'Hb II. 1–4." *NTS* 25: 166–79.
- Baillet, M. (1982). *Qumrân grotte 4:III*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. (1972). *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*. TOTC. Nottingham: IVP.
- Balz, Horst (1991). "οἰκουμένη." *EDNT* 2: 503–4.
- Barbu, Daniel (2014). "Aristeas the Tourist." *Bulletin der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Judaistische Forschung* 23: 5–12.
- Barclay, John M. G. (1996). *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Barclay, John M. G. (2007). *Against Apion*. FJTC. Leiden: Brill.
- Barker, Margaret (1987). *The Older Testament: The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- Barker, Margaret (1989). "The Temple Measurements and the Solar Calendar." In *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 62–66.
- Barker, Margaret (1991). *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. London: SPCK.
- Barker, Margaret (1995). *On Earth as it is in Heaven: Temple Symbolism in the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Barker, Margaret (1999). "The High Priest and the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill: 93–111.
- Barker, Margaret (2003). *The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy*. London: T&T Clark.
- Barker, Margaret (2004). *Temple Theology: An Introduction*. London: SPCK.
- Barker, Margaret (2008). "Review of Philip S. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*." *JTS* 59: 246–48.
- Barnard, Jody A. (2012). *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 331. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Barr, James (1978). "Review of J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*." *JTS* 29: 517–30.
- Barrett, C. K. (1954). "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 363–93.
- Bartels, K. H. (1986). "First, Firstborn." *NIDNTT* 1: 664–69.
- Barton, Stephen C. (2015). "Why Do Things Move People? The Jerusalem Temple as Emotional Repository." *JSNT* 37: 351–80.
- Bateman, Herbert W. IV (1997). *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5–13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*. American University Studies vii, 193. New York: Lang.
- Bauckham, Richard (1983). "The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as Midrash." In *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 33–76.
- Bauckham, Richard (1990a). "Early Jewish Visions of Hell." *JTS* 41: 355–85.
- Bauckham, Richard (1990b). *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bauckham, Richard (1993). *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bauckham, Richard (1996). "Josephus' Account of the Temple in *Contra Apionem* 2:102–109." In *Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill: 327–47.
- Bauckham, Richard (1999). "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. *JSJSup* 63. Leiden: Brill: 43–69.
- Bauckham, Richard (2001). "Apocalypses." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Vol. 1, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid. *WUNT* 2.140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 135–87.
- Bauckham, Richard (2003). "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Leiden: Brill: 63–89.
- Bauckham, Richard (2004). "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North. *Early Christianity in Context*. London: T&T Clark: 167–85.
- Bauckham, Richard (2009). "The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 15–36.

- Bauernfeind, O. (1972). "τρέχω, δρόμος, πρόδρομος." *TDNT* 8: 226–35.
- Baugh, S. M. (2006). "The Cloud of Witnesses in Hebrews 11." *WTJ* 68: 113–32.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1953). "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarials of the Dead Sea (Qumrān) Scrolls." *HTR* 46: 141–59.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1976). "The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, Revelation, and the Sanhedrin." *JBL* 95: 59–78.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1977). *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1987). "4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar." *RevQ* 12: 399–407.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1988). "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions." *RevQ* 13: 199–213.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1994). "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. *STDJ* 15. Leiden: Brill: 3–10.
- Bautch, Kelley Coblenz (2003). *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: "No-one Has Seen What I Have Seen."* *JSJSup* 81. Leiden: Brill.
- Beal, Timothy (1992). "Glossary." In *Reading Between Texts*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox: 21–24.
- Beale, G. K. (1999). *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. *NIGTC*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Beale, G. K. (2004a). "The Final Vision of the Apocalypse and its Implications for a Biblical Theology of the Temple." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 191–209.
- Beale, G. K. (2004b). *The Temple and the Church's Mission*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove IL: IVP.
- Beale, G. K. (2005). "Eden, the Temple, and the Church's Mission in the New Creation." *JETS* 48: 5–31.
- Beasley-Murray, George (1999). *John*. *WBC* 36. 2nd ed. Dallas: Word.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. (1997). *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. *VTSup* 48. Leiden: Brill.
- Begg, Christopher T. (1988). "Rereading of the 'Animal Rite' of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives." *CBQ* 50: 36–46.
- Begg, Christopher T. (2005). *Judean Antiquities Books 5–7*. *FJTC*. Leiden: Brill.
- Begg, Christopher T. and Paul Spilsbury (2005). *Judean Antiquities Books 8–10*. *FJTC*. Leiden: Brill.
- Behm, Johannes (1964). "αἶμα, αἶματεχυσία." *TDNT* 1: 172–77.

- Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl (2003). *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 2, 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud (1998). "Micah 1.2–16: Observations and Possible Implications." *JSOT* 77: 103–20.
- Bergsma, John S. (2009). "The Relationship Between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers)." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 36–51.
- Berner, Christoph (2006). *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen in Antiken Judentum*. BZAW 363. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bernstein, M. (2005). "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which has Outlived its Usefulness." *Textus* 22: 169–96.
- Best, Ernest (1960). "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament." *Int* 16: 273–199.
- Betz, Otto (1967). "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament." *RevQ* 6: 89–107.
- Betz, Otto (1987). "Firmness and Faith in Heb 11:11 and 28:16." In *Scripture—Meaning and Method: Essays Presented to Anthony Tyrrell Hanson for his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Barry P. Thompson. Hull: Hull University Press: 92–113.
- Beyer, Klaus (1994–2004). *Die Aramäischen texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bhayro, Siam (2005). *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with References to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*. AOAT 322. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Bickerman, E. J. (2007). "The Dating of Pseudo-Aristeas." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees*. Edited by Amran Tropper. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity AGAJU 68/1. Leiden: Brill. 1: 108–33.
- Bidawid, R. J. (1973). "4 Esdras." In *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: Part IV, Fascicle 3*. Edited by The Peshitta Institute. Leiden: Brill: i–iv, 1–50.
- Bietenhard, H. (1951). *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. WUNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bissoli, Giovanni (1994). *Il tempio nella letteratura giudaica e Neotestamentaria: Studio sulla corrispondenza fra tempio celeste e tempio terrestre*. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Analecta 57. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.
- Black, David Alan (1999a). "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 1): Overlooked Affinities between Hebrews and Paul." *Faith and Mission* 16 (2): 32–51.
- Black, David Alan (1999b). "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 2): The External Evidence Reconsidered." *Faith and Mission* 16 (3): 78–86.
- Black, Matthew (1961). *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. New York: Scribners.

- Black, Matthew (1970). *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Leiden: Brill.
- Black, Matthew (1984). "Two Unusual *Nomina Dei* in the Second Vision of Enoch." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press: 53–59.
- Black, Matthew and James C. VanderKam (1985). *The Book of Enoch, or I Enoch with Commentary and Textual Notes; with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters (72–82) by Otto Neugebauer*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph (1976). "The Structure of P." *CBQ* 38: 275–92.
- Blomberg, Craig L. (2008). "'But We See Jesus': The Relationship between the Son of Man in Hebrews 2:6 & Verse 9 and the Implications for English Translations." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald and Daniel Driver. LNTS 387. London: T&T Clark: 88–99.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele (1998). *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele (2005). "Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 1–14.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. (1990). *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2, 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *VT* 45: 429–30.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. (2009). "Abraham's Faith in Hebrews 11." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 364–73.
- Bogaert, Pierre (1969). *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. Paris: Cerf.
- Bokser, Baruch M. (1985). "Approaching Sacred Space." *HTR* 78: 279–99.
- Borgen, Peder (1984). "Philo of Alexandria." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 233–82.
- Bornkamm, Günther (1959). *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum*. BEvT. Munich: Kaiser.
- Bornkamm, Günther (1967). "μυστήριον." *TDNT* 4: 802–28.
- Borsch, Frederick H. (1967). *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. London: SCM.
- Böttrich, Christfried (1991). "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *JSP* 5: 35–52.
- Böttrich, Christfried (2001). "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: a Reaction to A. Orlov." *JSJ* 32: 445–70.

- Böttrich, Christfried (2012). "The 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch' (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission: An Overview." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Associate Editor). Studia Judaeslavica 4. Leiden: Brill: 37–67.
- Bovon, François (2002). *Luke 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Bow, Beverly A. (2000). "Melchizedek's Birth Narrative in 2 Enoch 68–73: Christian Correlations." In *For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 33–41.
- Box, G. H. (1912). *The Ezra-Apocalypse, Being Chapters 3–14 of the Book Commonly Known as 4 Ezra (or II Esdras)*. London: Pitman.
- Box, G. H. (1913). "IV Ezra." *APOT* 2: 542–624.
- Box, G. H. and W. O. E. Oesterley (1913). "The Book of Sirach." *APOT* 1: 268–517.
- Brady, Cora (1965). "The World to Come in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Worship* 39: 329–39.
- Braude, William G. (1958). *The Midrash on Psalms*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Braulik, Georg (1986). "Gottes Ruhe—Das Land oder der Tempel? Zu Psalm 95, 11." In *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen; Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gros*. Edited by Ernst Haag and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk: 33–44.
- Braun, H. (1970). "Das himmlische Vaterland bei Philo und im Hebräerbrief." In *Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70*. Edited by O. Böcher and K. Haacker. Wuppertal: Brockhaus: 319–27.
- Braun, H. (1984). *An die Hebräer*. HNT 14. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Brawley, Robert L. (1993). "Discursive Structure and the Unseen in Hebrews 2:8 and 11:1: A Neglected Aspect of the Context." *CBQ* 55: 81–98.
- Breech, Earl (1973). "These Fragments I have Shored against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra." *JBL* 92: 267–74.
- Brekelmans, H. W. (1965). "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom." *OTS* 14: 305–29.
- Brenner, Martin Leon (1991). *The Song of the Sea: Ex. 15:1–21*. BZAW 195. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Brockelmann, Carolo (1895). *Lexicon Syriacum*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark/Reuther & Reichard.
- Brooke, George J. (1985). *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Brooke, George J. (1993). "4QTestament of Levi^d (?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 83–100.

- Brooke, George J. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden.*" *JSJ* 26: 380–84.
- Brooke, George J. (1996). "From 'Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron' to 'Sanctuary of Adam': The Laicization of Temple Ideology in the Qumran Scrolls and its Wider Implications." *Journal for Semitics* 8: 119–45.
- Brooke, George J. (1999). "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 285–301.
- Brooke, George J. (2005a). *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination*. London: SPCK.
- Brooke, George J. (2005b). "Men and Women as Angels in Joseph and Aseneth." *JSP* 14: 159–77.
- Brooke, George J. (2007). "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 417–34.
- Brooke, George J. (2010). "The 'Apocalyptic' Community, the Matrix of the Teacher and Rewriting Scripture." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. *JSJSup* 141. Leiden: Brill: 37–53.
- Broshi, M. (1995). "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman. *STDJ* 16. Leiden: Brill: 9–22.
- Brown, Raymond E. (1968). *The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the New Testament*. FBBS 21. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Bruce, F. F. (1959). *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. London: Tyndale Press.
- Bruce, F. F. (1963). "'To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes.'" *NTS* 9: 217–32.
- Bruce, F. F. (1978). *The Time is Fulfilled*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bruce, F. F. (1985). "The Structure and Argument of Hebrews." *SwJT* 28: 6–12.
- Bruce, F. F. (1990). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Buchanan, G. W. (1972). *To the Hebrews*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday.
- Büchner, Dirk L. (2007). "Leuitikon." In *NETS*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Electronic ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 82–106.
- Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd (2003). *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. SVTP 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Bultmann, Rudolph (1964). "ἀληθεια, ἀληθής, ἀληθινός, ἀληθεύω." *TDNT* 1: 232–51.
- Bultmann, Rudolph and K. H. Rengstorff (1964). "ἐλπίς κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 2: 517–35.

- Burge, Gary M. (2010). *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to "Holy Land" Theology*. London: SPCK.
- Burkes, Shannon (2002). "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon." *HTR* 95: 21–44.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford (1913). *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. The Schweich Lectures, 1913. London: Oxford University Press.
- Burtneff, J. H. (1958). "Plato, Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *LQ* 10: 54–64.
- Burton, Ernest de Witt (1976). *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek*. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Burton, Gideon O. (1996–2003) "Hendiadys." *Silva Rhetoricae*, <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>.
- Caird, G. B. (1959). "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *CJT* 5: 44–51.
- Caird, G. B. (1970). "The Christological Basis of Christian Hope." In *The Christian Hope*. Theological Collections 13. London: SPCK: 9–24.
- Caird, G. B. (1984). "Son by Appointment." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by W. C. Wienrich. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press. 1: 73–81.
- Calaway, Jared C. (2013). *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary. Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*. WUNT 2, 349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Callaway, P. (1985). "Exegetische Erwägungen zur Tempelrolle XXIX, 7–10." *RevQ* 12: 95–104.
- Callaway, P. (1989). "Extending Divine Revelation: Micro-Compositional Studies in the Temple Scroll." In *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 149–62.
- Calvin, John (1996). *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. Ages Software. CD ed. Albany, NY.
- Campbell, Constantine R. (2007). *Verbal Aspect in the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 13. New York: Lang.
- Campbell, Constantine R. (2008a). *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Campbell, Constantine R. (2008b). *Verbal Aspect in Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 15. New York: Lang.
- Campbell, Constantine R. (2011). "Breaking Perfect Rules: The Traditional Understanding of the Greek Perfect." In *Discourse Studies & Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*. Edited by Stephen E. Runge. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software: 139–55.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. (2004). *The Exegetical Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4. London: T&T Clark.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. (2005). "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique." In *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*. Edited by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pietersen. London: T&T Clark: 43–68.

- Caneday, A. B. (2008). "The Eschatological World Already Subjected to the Son: The οἰκουμένη of Hebrews 1:6 and the Son's Enthronement." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. LNTS 387. London: T&T Clark: 28–39.
- Caquot, A. (1988). "Le service des anges." *RevQ* 13: 421–49.
- Caquot, A. (1998). "Les Testaments Qoumrâniens des Pères du Sacerdoce." *RHPR* 78: 3–26.
- Carlson, David C. (1982). "Vengeance and Angelic Mediation in Testament of Moses 9 and 10." *JBL* 101: 85–98.
- Carlsson, Leif (2004). *Round Trips to Heaven: Otherworldly Travellers in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Lund Studies in the History of Religions 19. Lund: Department of History and Anthropology of Religions, Lund University.
- Casey, J. M. (1982). "Christian Assembly in Hebrews: A Fantasy Island." *TD* 30: 323–35.
- Cathcart, Kevin J. and Robert P. Gordon (1989). *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. ArBib. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Gazier.
- Charles, J. Daryl (1990). "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews." *JETS* 33: 171–78.
- Charles, R. H. (1906). *Anecdota Oxoniensia, the Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Charles, R. H. (1908). *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Charles, R. H. (1912). *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Charles, R. H. (1913a). "The Assumption of Moses." *APOT* 2: 407–24.
- Charles, R. H. (1913b). "Book of Enoch." *APOT* 2: 163–277.
- Charles, R. H. (1913c). "The Book of Jubilees." *APOT* 2: 1–82.
- Charles, R. H. (1913d). "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch: Introduction." *APOT* 2: 425–30.
- Charles, R. H. (1913e). "II Baruch, or the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *APOT* 2: 470–526.
- Charles, R. H. (1913f). "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *APOT* 2: 296–367.
- Charles, R. H. (1966). *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1980). "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 12. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 135–51.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1981a). "Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in the Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings." In *Christian and Jewish Self-Definition. Volume 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and Alan Mendelson. London: SCM: 27–55.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1981b). *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, with a Supplement*. SBLSCS 75. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1985). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. SNTSMS 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Charlesworth, James H. (1993). "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." In *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. JSPSup 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 20–43.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1998). "The Date of the Parables of Enoch (1 En 37–71)." *Hen* 20: 93–98.
- Charlesworth, James H. and B. A. Strawn (1996). "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yahad found in Cave IV." *RevQ* 17: 403–35.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (1994a). "Blessings (1QSb)." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 119–31.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (1994b). "Rule of the Congregation." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 108–17.
- Chazon, Esther G. (1992–93). "On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer." *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 15: 1–21.
- Chazon, Esther G. (1994). "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications." *DSD* 1: 265–84.
- Chazon, Esther G. (1999). "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 1: 244–70.
- Chazon, Esther G. (2000). "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947–1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: 217–25.
- Chazon, Esther G. (2003). "Human and Angelic Prayer in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, with the Collaboration of Ruth Clements and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 48. Leiden: Brill: 35–47.
- Chester, Andrew N. (1991). "The Sibyl and the Temple." In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 37–69.
- Chialà, Sabino (2007). "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 153–78.

- Childs, Brevard S. (1969). "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon." *Int* 23: 20–31.
- Childs, Brevard S. (2001). *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Chilton, Bruce D. (1987). *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. ArBib. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.
- Church, Philip (2008). "The True Tent which the Lord has Pitched: Balaam's Oracles in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. LNTS 387. London: T&T Clark: 145–57.
- Church, Philip (2011a). "God Has by No Means Rejected His People' (Rom 11:1): A Response to the Accusation of 'Replacement Theology'." In *The Gospel and the Land of Promise: Christian Approaches to the Land of the Bible*. Edited by Philip Church, Peter Walker, Tim Bulkeley and Tim Meadowcroft. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock: 147–57.
- Church, Philip (2011b). "Here We Have No Lasting City' (Heb 13:14): The Promised Land in the Letter to the Hebrews." In *The Gospel and the Land of Promise: Christian Approaches to the Land of the Bible*. Edited by Philip Church, Peter Walker, Tim Bulkeley and Tim Meadowcroft. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock: 45–57.
- Church, Philip (2013a). "4Q174 and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*. Edited by Shani Tzoref and Ian Young. PHSC 20. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias: 333–60.
- Church, Philip (2013b). "The Temple in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in Hebrews." *TynBul* 64: 109–28.
- Church, Philip (2017). "What are Human Beings that you are Mindful of them' (Heb 2:6): An Anthropological/Ecological Reading of Heb 2:5–9." In *Creation and Hope*. Edited by Nicola Hoggard Creegan and Andrew Shepherd. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Chyutin, Michael (1997). *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. JSPSup 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Clements, R. E. (1965). *God and Temple*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Clifford, R. J. (1972). *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. HSM. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee (1999). "Hebrews 1:6: Source and Significance." *BBR* 9: 51–64.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee (2001). "Structure and Interpretation in Hebrews 8:1–10:18: A Symphony in Three Movements." *BBR* 11: 179–201.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee (2012). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Cody, Aelred (1960). *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspectives*. St Meinrad, IN: Grail Publications.
- Cohn, Leopold (1898). "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria." *JQR* 10: 277–332.

- Collins, Adela Yarbro (1976). "Composition and Redaction of the Testament of Moses 10." *HTR* 69: 179–86.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro (1995a). "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press: 59–93.
- Collins, John J. (1973a). "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 15–32.
- Collins, John J. (1973b). "Some Remaining Tradition-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 38–43.
- Collins, John J. (1974a). "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina." *JJS* 25: 365–80.
- Collins, John J. (1974b). "The Provenance of the Third Sibylline Oracle." *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 2: 1–18.
- Collins, John J. (1974c). *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Collins, John J. (1975). "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25: 596–612.
- Collins, John J. (1977). "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age." *HR* 17 (2): 121–42.
- Collins, John J. (1978). "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg." In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 1: 315–22.
- Collins, John J. (1980). "The Heavenly Representative The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. SBLSCS 12. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 111–33.
- Collins, John J. (1982). "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers." *CBQ* 44: 91–111.
- Collins, John J. (1983a). "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 531–47.
- Collins, John J. (1983b). "Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 317–472.
- Collins, John J. (1984a). "The Sibylline Oracles." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 357–81.
- Collins, John J. (1984b). "Testaments." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 325–55.

- Collins, John J. (1987). "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition." In *Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. ANRW 2, 20.1. Berlin: De Gruyter: 421–59.
- Collins, John J. (1992). "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *NTS* 38: 448–66.
- Collins, John J. (1993). *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Collins, John J. (1994). "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Edited by Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici and Angela Standhartinger. NovTSup 74. Leiden: Brill.
- Collins, John J. (1995b). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *JBL* 114: 314–16.
- Collins, John J. (1995c). "A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press: 43–58.
- Collins, John J. (1997a). *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge.
- Collins, John J. (1997b). *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Collins, John J. (1998). *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Collins, John J. (2000a). *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Collins, John J. (2000b). "Powers in Heaven: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 9–28.
- Collins, John J. (2003). "Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*." *JSJ* 24: 73–79.
- Collins, John J. (2004a). "Before the Fall: The Earliest Interpretations of Adam and Eve." In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. JSJSup 83. Leiden: Brill 293–308.
- Collins, John J. (2004b). "The Third Sibyl Revisited." In *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran and Ruth A. Clements. JSJSup 89. Leiden: Brill: 3–19.
- Collins, John J. (2006). "The Yahad and 'The Qumran Community'." In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill: 81–96.

- Collins, John J. (2007a). "The Angelic Life." In *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Edited by Turid Carlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Ekstasis 1. Berlin: De Gruyter: 291–310.
- Collins, John J. (2007b). "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 216–27.
- Collins, John J. (2007c). "'Enochic Judaism' and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill: 283–99.
- Collins, John J. (2007d). "The Nature and Aims of the Sect Known from the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill: 31–52.
- Collins, John J. (2009). "Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 16: 351–69.
- Collins, Marilyn F. (1972). "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *JSJ* 3: 97–116.
- Comfort, Philip W. and David P. Barrett (2001). *The Text of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts; New and Complete Transcriptions with Photographs*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.
- Coppens, E. (1956). "La Portée Messianique du Psaume CX." *ETL* 32: 5–23.
- Cornely, R. (1910). *Commentarius in librum Sapientiae*. Paris: Lethielleux.
- Cosby, M. R. (1988). "The Rhetorical Composition of Hebrews 11." *JBL* 107: 257–73.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland (1996). *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Chronologically Arranged with Notes, Prefaces, and Elucidations*. ANF 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland (1997). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. ANF 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Craigie, Peter C. (1983). *Psalms 1–50*. WBC 19. Waco, TX: Word.
- Crawford, Sidnie White (1985). "Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll." *JQR* 85: 259–73.
- Crawford, Sidnie White (2000). *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Scrolls 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Crawford, Sidnie White (2008). *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Cross, Frank Moore (1953). "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah." *JNES* 12: 274–77.
- Cross, Frank Moore (1973). *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cross, Frank Moore (1994). "Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule*

- of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 57.
- Cross, Frank Moore (1995). *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Culler, Jonathan (2001). *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction. With a New Preface by the Author*. London: Routledge.
- Cullmann, Oscar (1962). *Christ and Time*. Rev. ed. London: SCM.
- Culy, Martin M. (2009). "Review of Constantine R. Campbell, *Basics of Verbal aspect in Biblical Greek*." *JETS* 52: 851–53.
- D'Angelo, M. R. (1979). *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 42. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Daniélou, Jean (1957). "La symbolique du temple de Jerusalem chez Philon et Josephe." In *La symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux*. Edited by Estremo Oriente. Serie Orientale Rome XIV. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio: 83–90.
- Daschke, Derek (2010). *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalyptic*. BibInt 99. Leiden: Brill.
- Davenport, Gene L. (1971). *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. StPB. Leiden: Brill.
- Dauids, Peter H. (1990). *The First Epistle of Peter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Davidson, A. B. (1959). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: With Introduction and Notes*. Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Davidson, Maxwell J. (1992). *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. JSPSup 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Davidson, Richard M. (1981). *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TUPOS Structures*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 11. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.
- Davidson, Richard M. (2001). "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19–20: The Old Testament Background." *AUSS* 39: 175–90.
- Davidson, Richard M. (2002). "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's 'Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited.'" *AUSS* 40: 69–88.
- Davies, G. H. (1973). "Psalm 95." *ZAW* 85: 183–95.
- Davies, John A. (1998). "The Temple Scroll from Qumran and the Ultimate Temple." *RTR* 57: 1–21.
- Davies, Philip R. (1977). *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran: its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Davies, Philip R. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *JTS* 46: 236–39.

- Davies, Philip R. (2006). "The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War." In *The Bible and The Scrolls. Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press. 1: 209–32.
- Davies, Philip R., George J. Brooke and Phillip R. Callaway (2002). *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Davies, W. D. (1974). *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Davila, James R. (1999). "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 2: 461–85.
- Davila, James R. (2000). *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Davila, James R. (2002). "The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *DSD* 9: 1–19.
- Davila, James R. (2005a). "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?" *JSP* 15: 3–61.
- Davila, James R. (2005b). *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*. JSJSup 105. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1953). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1960). "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NovT* 4: 182–235.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1974). "Notes on the Testament of Levi II–VII." In *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M. A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by M. S. H. G. Heerma van Voss, Ph. H. Houwink ten Cate and N. A. van Uchelen. Assen: Van Gorcum: 132–45.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1975). *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1987). "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints." In *Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. ANRW 2, 20.1. Berlin: De Gruyter: 359–420.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1991). *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus De Jonge*. NovTSup 73. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus, in cooperation with H. W. Hollander, H. J. De Jonge and T. H. Korteweg (1978). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus and Johannes Tromp (1998). "Jacob's Son Levi in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International: 203–36.

- De Souza, E. B. (2005). "The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthly Counterparts." PhD Thesis, Andrews University.
- De Wet, Chris L. (2010). "The Messianic Interpretation of Psalm 8:4–6 in Hebrews 2:6–9. Part II." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York: T&T Clark: 113–25.
- De Young, James Calvin (1960). *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*. Kampen: Kok.
- Dean-Otting, Mary (1984). *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Lang.
- Decock, P. B. (1983). "Holy Ones, Sons of God, and The Transcendent Future of the Righteous in 1 Enoch and the New Testament." *Neot* 17: 70–82.
- Dederling, S. (1973). "Apocalypse of Baruch." In *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: Part IV, Fascicle 3*. Edited by The Peshitta Institute. Leiden: Brill: i–iv, 1–50.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard (1967). *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*. SUNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Delcor, M. (1952). "L'eschatologie des documents de Khirbet Qumran." *RevScRel* 26: 363–86.
- Delitzsch, Franz (1868). *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Delling, G. (1964). "ἄρχω, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 1: 478–89.
- Delling, G. (1972). "τέλος, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 8: 49–87.
- DesCamp, Mary Therese (2007). *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods through a Cognitive Lens*. BibInt. Leiden: Brill.
- DeSilva, David A. (1995). *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 152. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- DeSilva, David A. (2000a). "Entering God's Rest: Eschatology and the Socio-Rhetorical Strategy of Hebrews." *TJ* 21: 25–43.
- DeSilva, David A. (2000b). *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle 'to the Hebrews'*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- DeSilva, David A. (2002). *Introducing the Apocrypha; Message, Content and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand (1977). *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung*. StPB. Leiden: Brill.
- Dillmann, August (1853). *Das Buch Henoch*. Uebersetzt und erklärt ed. Leipzig: Vogel.
- Dimant, Devorah (1978). "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective." In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 1: 323–39.
- Dimant, Devorah (1982). "Jerusalem and the Temple in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90) in the Light of the Ideology of the Dead Sea Sect." *Shnaton* 5–6: 177–93 (*non vidi*).

- Dimant, Devorah (1983). "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *VT* 33: 14–29.
- Dimant, Devorah (1984). "Qumran Sectarian Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 483–550.
- Dimant, Devorah (1986). "4Q Florilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple." In *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à V. Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Label and J. Riaud. Leuven: Peeters: 165–89.
- Dimant, Devorah (1996). "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin. Bethesda: University Press of Maryland: 93–103.
- Dimant, Devorah (2007). "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill: 297–305.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo (1999). "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: a New Look at an Old Theory." *JSP* 20: 3–38.
- Docherty, Susan E. (2009). *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Doering, Lutz (2009). "Purity and Impurity in Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 261–75.
- Doering, Lutz (2012). *Ancient Jewish Letters: and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. WUNT 2, 298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Donadoni, S. (1960). "Un frammento della versione copta del 'libro di Enoch'." *AcOr* 25: 197–202.
- Donaldson, Terence L. (1985). *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Doran, Robert (1987). "T. Mos. 4:8 and the Second Temple." *JBL* 106: 491–92.
- Draper, J. A. (1988). "The Twelve Apostles as Foundation Stones of the Heavenly Jerusalem and the Foundation of the Qumran Community." *Neot* 22: 41–61.
- Drawnel, Henryk (2004). *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. JSJSup 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Duhaime, Jean (1982). "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran." *CBQ* 49: 32–56.
- Duhaime, Jean (2004). *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6. London: T&T Clark.
- Dunn, J. D. G. (2006). *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed. London: SCM.
- Dunnill, J. (1992). *Covenant and Sacrifice in the letter to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dupont-Sommer, A. (1952). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. (1967). "Observations on 'Un nouveau manuscrit de la Mer Morte: "Le rouleau du Temple"' by Y. Yadin." *CRAI* 111: 617–19.
- Dupont, J. (1974). "Assis à la droite de Dieu: L'Interpretation du Ps. 110 dans le Nouveau Testament." In *Resurrexit: Actes du Symposium International sur la Résurrection de Jésus*. Edited by Édouard Dhanis, S.J. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana: 340–422.
- Durham, John I. (1987). *Exodus*. WBC 3. Waco, TX: Word.
- Eaton, John (2003). *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with an Introduction and New Translation*. London: T&T Clark.
- Eco, Umberto (1979). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ego, B. (1991). "Der Diener im palast des Himmlischen Königs. Zur Interpretation einer priesterlichen Tradition in rabbinischen Judentum." In *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 361–84.
- Ego, B. (1999). "Der Strom der Tora: zur Rezeption eines tempeltheologischen Motivs in frühjüdischer Zeit." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 205–14.
- Eisele, Wilfried (2003). *Ein Unterschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*. BZNW 116. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle (1997). "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 380–96.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle (2005). "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 213–37.
- Elgvin, Torleif (1995). "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *RevQ* 16: 559–80.
- Elgvin, Torleif (1996). "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to Sapiential Work A." In *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill: 126–65.
- Elgvin, Torleif (1998). "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 112–50.
- Elgvin, Torleif (1999). "Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475." In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill: 577–91.

- Elgvin, Torleif (2003). "4QRenewed Earth." In *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon: 464–73.
- Elgvin, Torleif (2004). "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction." In *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill: 67–87.
- Eliade, Mircea (1959). *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Elior, Rachel (1997). "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions." *JSQ* 4: 217–67.
- Ellingworth, Paul (1986). "Jesus and the Universe in Hebrews." *EvQ* 58 (4): 337–50.
- Ellingworth, Paul (1993). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Ellingworth, Paul and Eugene A. Nida (1983). *A Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Elliott, John H. (2000). *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 37B. New York: Doubleday.
- Endres, John C. (1987). *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Enns, Peter E. (1993). "Creation and Recreation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1–4:13." *WTJ* 55: 255–80.
- Enns, Peter E. (1997). "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3:1–4:13." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 352–63.
- Eshel, Esther (2003). "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion Center, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 48. Leiden: Brill: 69–88.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel (2002). "Toponymic Midrash in 1 Enoch and in Other Second Temple Jewish Literature." *Hen* 24: 115–30.
- Eshel, Hanan and Esther Eshel (2003). "Separating Levi from Enoch: Response to 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.'" In *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill. 2: 458–68.
- Eshel, Hanan and Esther Eshel (2005). "New Fragments From Qumran: 4QGENF, 4QISAB 4Q226, 8QGEN and XQPAPENOCH." *DSD* 12: 134–57.
- Eskola, Timo (2001). *The Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Discourse*. WUNT 2, 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Esler, Philip Francis (1994). "The Social Function of 4 Ezra." *JSNT* 53: 99–123.
- Esler, Philip Francis (2014). "The Meaning of Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36: A New Interpretation." Paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature 2014 International Meeting, Vienna, 7 July 2014.
- Evans, Craig A. (1992). *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Evans, Craig A. (1993). "Looking for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. *JSNTSup*, 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 47–51.
- Evans, Craig A. (1995). "A Note on the 'First-Born Son' of 4Q369." *DSD* 2: 185–201.
- Evans, Craig A. (2000). "Simon ben Kosiba." *DNTB* 1112–16.
- Evans, Trevor V. (2004). "Future Directions for Aspect Studies in Ancient Greek." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor, John A. L. Lee, Peter R. Burton and Richard E. Whitaker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 199–206.
- Falk, Daniel K. (1998). *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill.
- Fanning, Buist (1990). *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fanning, Buist (2008). "Review of Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*." *JETS* 51: 394–97.
- Farrar, F. W. (1893). *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. CGTSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearghail, F. Ó. (1978). "Sir 50, 5–21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole Offering." *Bib.* 59: 310–16.
- Fee, Gordon D. (1987). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Felder, Stephen (2002). "What is The Fifth Sibylline Oracle?" *JSJ* 33: 363–85.
- Feldman, Jackie (2006). "A City that Makes all Israel Friends': Normative Communitas and the Struggle for Religious Legitimacy in Pilgrimages to the Second Temple." In *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz. Leiden: Brill: 109–26.
- Feldman, Louis H. (1984). "Flavius Josephus Revisited: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance." In *ANRW*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. *ANRW* 2, 21.2. Berlin: De Gruyter: 763–862.
- Feldman, Louis H. (2000). *Judean Antiquities 1–4*. FJTC. Leiden: Brill.
- Field, Frederick (1870). *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum In Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Field, Frederick (2005). *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. CahRB. Paris: Gabalda.

- Filson, F. V. (1967). *'Yesterday': A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*. London: SCM.
- Fischer, Bonifatius, Iohanne Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele and Robertus Weber (1969). *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Fishbane, M. (1979). *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Fishbane, M. (1985). *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fisher, Loren R. (1963). "The Temple Quarter." *JSS* 8: 34–41.
- Fisher, Loren R. (1965). "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament." *VT* 15: 313–24.
- Fisk, Bruce Norman (2001). *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. JSPSup 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph (1997). *Essays on The Semitic Background of the New Testament*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (1961). "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7: 297–333.
- Flender, O. (1975). "οἰκουμένη." *NIDNTT* 1: 518–19.
- Flender, O. (1976). "εἰκὼν." *NIDNTT* 2: 286–88.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (1997a). "The Destruction of the Temple and the Relativization of the Old Covenant: Mark 13:31 and Matthew 5:18." In *'The Reader Must Understand': Eschatology and the Bible*. Edited by K. E. Brower and M. W. Elliot. Leicester: Apollos: 145–69.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (1997b). "The High Priest as a Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case." In *SBLSP* 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press: 161–93.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (1997c). *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology, and Soteriology*. WUNT 2, 94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (1998). "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice*." In *SBLSP* 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1: 367–99.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (2000). "Wisdom Christology and the Partings of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity." In *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 52–68.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (2002). *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (2004). "The Cosmology of P and Theological Anthropology in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London: T&T Clark. 1: 69–113.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (2012). "2 Enoch and the New Perspective on Apocalyptic." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov,

- Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Associate Editor). *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill: 127–48.
- Flint, Peter W. (2005). "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 224–33.
- Flusser, David (1959). "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam vii." *IEJ* 9: 96–109.
- Fohrer, G. and E. Lohse (1971). "σιών, κ.τ λ.," *TDNT* 7: 292–338.
- Forbes, Nevill (1913). "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *APOT* 2: 431–69.
- Fossum, Jarl E. (1985). *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Fossum, Jarl E. (1995). *Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. NTOA 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- France, R. T. (1996). "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor." *TynBul* 47: 245–76.
- Frankowski, Janusz (1983). "Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament: A Reconsideration of the Question in the Light of Heb 1,3." *BZ* 27: 183–94.
- Freedman, David Noel (1975). "Early Israelite History in the Light of Early Israelite Poetry." In *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Hans Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press: 3–35.
- Freedman, David Noel (1977). "A Letter to the Readers." *BA* 40 (2): 46–48.
- Freedman, David Noel (1981). "Temple Without Hands." In *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977*. Edited by Avraham Biran. Jerusalem: Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion: 21–30.
- Frennesson, B. (1999). *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. *Studia semitica upsaliensia* 14. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Fretheim, Terence E. (1991). *Exodus*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox.
- Frevel, Christian (2010). "σήμερον-Understanding Psalm 95 within, and without, Hebrews." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York: T&T Clark: 165–93.
- Frey, J. (2000). "The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947–1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: 800–816.
- Fritsch, Ch. T. (1966). "To 'ANTITYPON.'" In *Studia Biblica et Semetica: Theodoro Christiano Vriezen qui munere Professoris theologiae per xxv annos functus est ab*

- amicis, collegis, discipulis dedicata*. Edited by W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude. Wageningen: Veenman: 100–107.
- Früchtel, Ursula (1968). *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. ALGHJ 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald (2005). *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. NovTSup 119. Leiden: Brill.
- Fuhrmann, Sebastian (2010). "The Son, the Angels and the Odd: Psalm 8 in Hebrews 1–2." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York: T&T Clark: 83–98.
- Fuller Dow, Lois K. (2010). *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem*. New Testament Monographs 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Fyall, Robert (2004). "A Curious Silence: The Temple in 1 and 2 Kings." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 49–58.
- Gäbel, George (2006). *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WUNT 2, 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gäbel, George (2007). "Rivals in Heaven: Angels in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings-Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: De Gruyter: 357–76.
- Gagnon, Robert A. (1992). "How did the Rule of the Community Obtain its Final Shape? A Review of Scholarly Research." *JSP* 5: 61–79.
- Galling, K. (1950). "Durch die Himmel hindurchgeschritten (Heb 4,14)." *ZNW* 43: 263–64.
- Gammie, John G. (1974). "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature." *JBL* 93: 356–85.
- Gane, Roy E. (2000). "Reopening *Katapetasma* ('Veil') in Hebrews 6:19." *AUSS* 38: 5–8.
- García Martínez, Florentino (1992). *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill.
- García Martínez, Florentino (1999). "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 2: 431–60.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (1998). *Qumran Cave 11.2: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Gardner, Anne (2013). "'Holy Ones' and '(Holy) People' in Daniel and 1QM." In *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*. Edited by Shani Tzoref and Ian Young. PHSC 20. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias: 161–93.
- Garnet, Paul (1997). "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1–7: Towards a Serek Text History." *JSP*: 67–78.

- Gärtner, Bertil (1965). *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaster, Theodore H. (1976). *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*. 3d rev. and enl. ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Gaston, LLOYD (1970). *No Stone On Another: Studies on the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Gaylord, H. E. (1983a). "The Slavonic Version of 111 Baruch." PhD, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (*non vidi*).
- Gaylord, H. E. Jr. (1983b). "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 653–79.
- Geffcken, J. (1902a). *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Geffcken, J. (1902b). *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracle Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Hinrichs (*non vidi*).
- Gelardini, Gabriella (2005). "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*: Its Function, Its Basis, Its Theological Interpretation." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 107–27.
- Gelardini, Gabriella (2007). "*Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht*": *Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tisha be-Aw*. BibInt 83. Leiden: Brill.
- Gelston, A. (1972). "A Note on II Sam 7:10." *ZAW* 84: 92–94.
- Georgi, Dieter (1980). *Weisheit Salomos*. JSHRZ. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.
- Georgi, Dieter (2005). "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 239–44.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard (1988). *Psalms: Part 1; with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Gese, Hartmut (1981a). *Essays in Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Gese, Hartmut (1981b). "Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology: the Consistent Development of Biblical Theology." *HBT* 3: 23–57.
- Gheorghita, Radu (2003). *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3–4 in Heb 10:37–38*. WUNT 2, 160. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gieschen, Charles A. (1997). "The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in 2 *Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 364–79.
- Gieschen, Charles A. (1998). *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGJU 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Gieschen, Charles A. (2003). "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology." *VC* 57: 115–58.

- Gieschen, Charles A. (2007). "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 238–49.
- Gilbert, M. (1984). "Wisdom Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 283–324.
- Ginzberg, Louis (1906). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." In *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1: 91–92.
- Ginzberg, Louis (1913–1967). *The Legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Gleason, Randall C. (2000). "The Old Testament Background of Rest in Hebrews 3:7–4:11." *BSac* 157: 281–303.
- Goff, Matthew (2003a). "Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*." *JBL* 122: 172–75.
- Goff, Matthew (2003b). *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill.
- Goff, Matthew (2007). *Discerning Wisdom: the Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. VTSup 116. Leiden: Brill.
- Goldingay, John (2001). *Isaiah*. NIBCOT. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Goldingay, John (2006). *Psalms Volume 1: Psalms 1–41*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Goldingay, John (2008). *Psalms Volume 3: Psalms 90–150*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1973). "The Testament of Moses: Its Content, its Origin and its Attestation in Josephus." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Missoula MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 44–52.
- Goodenough, Edwin R. (1935). *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goodman, Martin (1986). "Jewish Literature Composed in Greek." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135), Volume III 1*. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 470–704.
- Goodman, Martin (2010). "The Qumran Sectarians and the Temple in Jerusalem." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. Leiden: Brill: 263–73.
- Goppelt, Leonhard A. (1978). *A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Goppelt, Leonhard A. (1982). *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Gordon, Robert P. (2000). *Hebrews. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Gordon, Robert P. (2008). *Hebrews. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Görg, M. (1990). “בְּשִׁי,” *TDOT* 6: 420–38.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Alon (2002). “Ben Sira’s Praise of the Fathers.” In *Ben Sira’s God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham-Ushaw College, 2001*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: De Gruyter: 235–67.
- Gourgues, M. (1978). *À la droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Psaume 110:1 dans le Nouveau Testament*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda.
- Grabbe, Lester L. (1997). *Wisdom of Solomon*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Grabbe, Lester L. and James H. Charlesworth (1981). “Chronography in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.” In *SBLSP 20*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 49–63.
- Grässer, Erich (1990–97). *An die Hebräer*. EKKNT XVII. Zürich: Benzinger Verlag.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. (1969). “Review: The Small Caves of Qumran.” *JAOS* 89: 128–41.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone (1990). “Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document.” In *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by H. W. Attridge, John J. Collins and Thomas J. Tobin S.J. College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5. Lanham, MD: University Press of America: 153–61.
- Greenfield, Jonas, C., Michael Stone and Esther Eshel (2004). *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Grelot, P. (1958). “La géographie mythique d’Hénoch et ses sources orientales.” *RB* 65: 33–69.
- Grierson, Fiona (2008). “The Testament of Moses.” *JSP* 17: 265–80.
- Grogan, Geoffrey W. (1969). “Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5–18.” *VE* 6: 54–71.
- Grossfeld, Bernard (1988). *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. ArBib 6. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Gruen, Erich S. (1998). *Heritage and Hellenism: the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gruen, Erich S. (2010). “Judaism in the Diaspora.” *DEJ* 77–96.
- Gruen, Erich S. (2013). “The Letter of Aristeas.” In *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 3: 271–68.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar (1980). *Apocalypticism and Merkavah Mysticism*. AGJU 14. Leiden: Brill.

- Gurtner, Daniel M. (2005a). "The 'House of the Veil' in Sirach 50." *JSP* 14: 187–200.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. (2005b). "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil." *NovT* 47: 344–53.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. (2008). "The 'Twenty-Fifth Year of Jeconiah' and the Date of 2 Baruch." *JSP* 18: 23–32.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. (2009). *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text: With Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Guthrie, Donald (1983). *The Letter to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Leicester: IVP.
- Guthrie, George H. (1994). *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. NovTSup 73. Leiden: Brill.
- Guthrie, George H. (1998). *Hebrews*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Guthrie, George H. (2003). "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research." *CBR* 1: 271–94.
- Guthrie, George H. and Russell D. Quinn (2006). "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:4–6 in Hebrews 2:5–9." *JETS* 49: 235–46.
- Habel, Norman C. (1965). "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives." *ZAW* 77: 297–323.
- Haber, Susan (2005). "From Priestly Torah to Christ Cultus: The Re-Vision of Covenant and Cult in Hebrews." *JSNT* 28 (1): 105–24.
- Hacham, Noah (2005). "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story." *JSJ* 36: 1–20.
- Hadas, Moses (1951). *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature. Dropsie College ed. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Hagen, Joost L. (2012). "No Longer 'Slavonic' Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Associate Editor). Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill: 7–34.
- Hagner, Donald A. (1983). *Hebrews*. A Good News Commentary. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Hagner, Donald A. (1990). *Hebrews*. NIBCNT. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Hagner, Donald A. (2002). *Encountering the Book of Hebrews*. Encountering Biblical Studies. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Hahn, Scott W. (2004). "A Broken Covenant and a Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15–22." *CBQ* 66: 416–36.
- Hahn, Scott W. (2005). "Covenant, Cult and the Curse-of-Death: διαθήκη in Heb 9:15–22." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 65–88.
- Hall, Robert G. (1988). "The 'Christian Interpolation' in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JBL* 107: 107–10.

- Hall, Stuart George (1979). *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments*. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hallbäck, Geert (1992). "The Fall of Zion and the Revelation of the Law: An Interpretation of 4 Ezra." *SJOT* 6: 263–92.
- Halperin, David (1988). *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Halpern-Amaru, B. (1994). *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. (1970). "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 20: 1–15.
- Hamm, Dennis (1990). "Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Jesus Factor." *CBQ* 52: 270–91.
- Hanhart, Robert (1983). *Esther*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum VII 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hannah, Darrell D. (1999). *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2, 109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hanson, R. P. C. (2002). *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Haran, M. (1985). *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Enquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Hardin, Michael (2000). "Sacrificial Language in Hebrews: Reappraising René Girard." In *Violence Renounced: René Girard, Biblical Studies and Peacemaking*. Edited by Willard M. Swartley. Studies in Peace and Scripture. Telford, PA: Pandora: 103–19.
- Harlow, Daniel C. (1996). *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. SVTP. Leiden: Brill.
- Harlow, Daniel C. (2001). "The Christianization of Early Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 3 Baruch." *JStJ* 32: 416–44.
- Harlow, Daniel C. (2010). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *DEJ* 295–98.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1970). "The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *HTR* 63: 503–14.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1971). "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *CBQ* 33: 1–17.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1973). "Interpreting Israel's History: *The Testament of Moses* as a Rewriting of Deut 31–34." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 59–68.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1974). *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature.

- Harrington, Daniel J. (1985). "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 297–377.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (1999). *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (2003a). "The 'Holy Land' in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch." In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill: 661–72.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (2003b). "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leuven: Peeters: 343–55.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (2005). *Jesus Ben Sira of Jerusalem: A Biblical Guide to Living Wisely*. Interfaces. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (2006a). "'Holy War' Texts among the Qumran Scrolls." In *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill: 175–83.
- Harrington, Daniel J. (2006b). "Recent Study of 4QInstruction." In *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill: 105–23.
- Harrington, Daniel J. and Maurya P. Horgan (1986). "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Perspectives. I. The Bible Rewritten." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 239–58.
- Harris, Murray J. (1978). "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament." *NIDNTT* 3: 1171–215.
- Harris, Murray J. (1984). "The Translation and Significance of Elohim in Psalm 45:7–8." *Tynbul* 35: 65–89.
- Harris, Murray J. (1985). "The Translation and Significance of 'O ΘΕΟΣ in Hebrews 1:8–9." *Tynbul* 36: 129–62.
- Hartley, John E. (1992). *Leviticus*. WBC 4. Dallas: Word.
- Hatina, Thomas R. (1999). "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1): 28–43.
- Hay, David M. (1973). *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS 18. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Hays, Richard B. (1989). *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hays, Richard B. (1993). "Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul: Abstract." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 42–46.
- Hays, Richard B. (2005). *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Hays, Richard B. (2009). "‘Here we have no Lasting City’: New Covenantalism in Hebrews." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 151–73.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1989). "The Dating of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments." *JJS* 40: 7–30.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1991). "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S. W. Sykes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 22–34.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1992a). "The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities." *JSJ* 23: 1–20.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1992b). "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira." *sjot* 6: 123–38.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1996). *The Jewish Temple: A Non-biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (2007). "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 385–400.
- Heidel, Alexander (1951). *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heinemann, Isaak (1973). *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Helyer, Larry R. (1976). "The Prototokos Title in Hebrews." *SBTh* 6: 3–28.
- Helyer, Larry R. (2002). *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Downers Grove IL: IVP.
- Helyer, Larry R. (2006). "The Prototokos Title in Hebrews 1:6." Paper presented at the St Andrews Conference on Hebrews and Christian Theology 19 July 2006: 1–22.
- Hempel, Charlotte (1996). "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QS^a." *DSD* 3: 253–69.
- Hempel, Charlotte (2000). "The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. H. Lim, L. W. Hurtado, A. G. Auld and A. Jack. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 187–95.
- Hempel, Charlotte (2010). "Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of the S Tradition." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill: 193–208.
- Hengel, Martin (1974). *Judaism and Hellenism*. London: SCM.
- Hengel, Martin (1976). *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religions*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hengel, Martin (1995). *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Henze, Matthias (2005). "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End Time." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited

- by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 207–9.
- Henze, Matthias (2006). "From Jeremiah to Baruch: Pseudepigraphy in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Leiden: Brill: 157–77.
- Henze, Matthias (2010). "Baruch, Second Book of." *DEJ* 426–28.
- Héring, J. (1970). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Epworth.
- Hilber, John W. (2005). *Cultic Prophecy in the Psalms*. BZAW 352. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hillers, Delbert R. (1984). *Micah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hilton, Naomi Henare (2013). "Traversing the Heavens: The State of Scholarship on 3 Baruch." *JSP* 22: 247–68.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1984). "R. Moses the Preacher and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *AJS Review* 9 (1): 55–78.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1986). "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The Book of the Watchers and Tours of Heaven." In *Jewish Spirituality: From The Bible Through The Middle Ages*. Edited by Arthur Green. World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of The Religious Quest 13. New York: Crossroad. 1: 145–65.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1993). *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1999a). "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Inter-marriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *JSQ* 6: 1–24.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1999b). "Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 6: 11–36.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (2000). "The Wisdom of the Scribe, the Wisdom of the Priest, and the Wisdom of the King according to Ben Sira." In *For a Later Generation: the Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (2002). "The Book of the Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem." *Hen* 24: 131–35.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (2006). *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. Jewish Culture and Contexts. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (2007). "Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill: 210–35.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (2016). "3 Baruch Revisited: Jewish or Christian Composition and Why It Matters." *ZAC* 20: 41–62.

- Hobbins, John F. (1998). "The Summing up of History in 2 Baruch." *JQR* 89: 45–79.
- Hofius, Otfried (1970a). "Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr. 10,19f." In *Der Ruf Jesu auf die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*. Edited by Eduard Lohse, Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 132–41.
- Hofius, Otfried (1970b). *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitl. Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*. WUNT 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hofius, Otfried (1972). *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetische-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19f und 10,19f*. WUNT 14. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hofmann, Norbert Johannes (2000). *Die Assumptio Mosis: Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung*. JSJSup 67. Leiden: Brill.
- Hollander, H. W. and M. De Jonge (1985). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend (1960). *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. ATDan 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget.
- Holmes, Michael W. (2007). *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Holmes, Stephen R. (2009). "Death in the Afternoon: Hebrews, Sacrifice and Soteriology." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 229–52.
- Holtz, Gudrun (2009). "Inclusivism at Qumran." *DSD* 16: 22–54.
- Holtzmann, Oskar (1926). *Das Neue Testament nach dem Stuttgarter Griechischen Text übersetzt und erklärt*. Giessen: Töpelmann.
- Honigman, Sylvie (2003). *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. London: Routledge.
- Honigman, Sylvie (2004). "La description de Jérusalem et de la Judée dans la Lettre D'aristée." *Athenaeum* 92 (1): 73–101.
- Hooker, Morna D. (2009). "Christ the 'End' of the Cult." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 189–212.
- Horgan, Maurya P. (1979). *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Horsley, Richard A. (2007). *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Horton, F. L. (1976). *The Melchizedek Tradition: Through the First Five Centuries of the Christian Era and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar (1994). "Psalm 95: Gattungsgeschichte, Kompositionskritische und bibletheologische Anfragen." In *Neue Wege der Psalmforschung*. Edited by K. Seybold and E. Zenger. Herders Biblische Studien 1. Freiburg: Herder: 29–44.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger (2005). *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Houtman, Cornelis (2002). *Exodus*. HCOt. Leuven: Peeters.
- Howell, Maribeth (1989). "Exodus 15,1b–18: A Poetic Analysis." *ETL* 65: 5–42.
- Hübner, H. (1993). "τέλειος, κ.τ.λ." *EDNT* 3: 342–48.
- Hughes, Graham (1979a). *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation*. SNTSMS 36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, J. J. (1979b). "Hebrews ix. 15ff and Galatians iii. 15ff: A Case Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure." *NovT* 21: 27–96.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe (1977). *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hultgård, Anders (1977). *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum 6–7. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Human, Dirk, J. (2010). "A Prophetic Voice for Africa from Psalm 95." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York: T&T Clark: 147–64.
- Humbert, J.-B. (1994). "L'espace sacré à Qumran." *RB* 101–102: 161–214.
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan (1995). *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and The Shepherd of Hermas*. JSPSup 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Hurowitz, Victor (Avigdor) (1985). "The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle." *JAOS* 105: 21–30.
- Hurowitz, Victor (Avigdor) (1992). *I have Built you an Exalted House*. JSOTSup 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Hurowitz, Victor (Avigdor) (2006). "Babylon in Bethel—New Light on Jacob's Dream." In *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*. Edited by Steven W. Holloway. Hebrew Bible Monographs 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix: 436–48.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. (1983). "How Platonic are Heb. viii. 5 and ix. 23f?" *JTS* 34: 156–68.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. (1984). "Eschatology and 'Platonism' in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *SBLSP* 23. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, CA: Society of Biblical Literature: 41–74.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. (1987). "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament*. Edited by Lincoln D. Hurst and N. T. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon: 151–64.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. (1990). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. SNTSMS 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hurtado, Larry W. (1988). *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. London: SCM.
- Idel, Moshe (1990). "Enoch is Metatron." *Immanuel* 24/25: 220–40.
- Instone-Brewer, David (2004). *Prayer and Agriculture*. TRENT 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Instone-Brewer, David (2011). *Feasts and Sabbath: Passover and Atonement*. TRENT 2A. Grand Rapids Eerdmans.
- Isaac, E. (1983). "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 6–89.
- Isaacs, Marie E. (1992). *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 73. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Isaacs, Marie E. (1997). "Hebrews 13:9–16 Revisited." *NTS* 43: 268–84.
- Jackson, David R. (2009). "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 411–25.
- Jacobson, Howard (1996). *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*. AGJU 31. Leiden: Brill.
- James, M. R. (1897). *Apocrypha Anecdota; Second Series*. TS 5.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janowski, Bernd (1990). "Tempel und Schöpfung. Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption." In *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung*. Edited by Ingo Baldermann. Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag: 37–69.
- Jastrow, Marcus (1989). *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and their Midrashic Literature*. New York: Judaica.
- Jefferies, Daryl F. (2008). "Scripture, Wisdom, and Authority in 4QInstruction: Understanding the use of Numbers 30:8–9 in 4Q416." *HS* 49: 87–98.
- Jellicoe, Sidney (1961). "St. Luke and the Letter of Aristaeas." *JBL* 80: 149–55.
- Jellicoe, Sidney (1964). "The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristaeas: A Re-examination." *NTS* 12: 144–50.
- Jellicoe, Sidney (1989 [1968]). *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Jeremias, J. (1971). "Hebräer 10:20: τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ." *ZNW* 62: 131.
- Jewett, R. (1981). *Letter to Pilgrims. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York: Pilgrim.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy (2006). *Hebrews: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Johnson, Richard W. (2001). *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 209. London: Sheffield Academic.

- Johnsson, W. G. (1973). "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." PhD Thesis, Vanderbilt University.
- Johnsson, W. G. (1978). "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JBL* 97: 239–51.
- Johnston, George (1981). "Christ as Archegos." *NTS* 27: 381–85.
- Jones, Kenneth R. (2011). *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70: Apocalypses and Related Pseudepigrapha*. JSJSup 151. Leiden: Brill.
- Jones, Peter Rhea (1979). "The Figure of Moses as a Heuristic Device for Understanding the Pastoral Intent of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *RevExp* 76: 95–107.
- Jones, Peter Rhea (1985). "A Superior Life: Hebrews 12:3–13:25." *RevExp* 82: 391–405.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan (1962). *Le rouleau de la guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân: commentaire et traduction*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Josephus (1926–1965). *Works*. London: Heinemann.
- Joslin, Barry C. (2007). "Can Hebrews be Structured? An Assessment of Eight Approaches." *CBR* 6: 99–129.
- Joslin, Barry C. (2008). *Hebrews, Christ and the Law: The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7:1–10:18*. PBM. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. (1973). "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest." *BSac* 130: 135–50.
- Kalengyo, Edison M. (2009). "The Sacrifice of Christ and the Ganda Sacrifice: A Contextual Interpretation in Relation to the Eucharist." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 302–18.
- Kalimi, Isaac (1990). "The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon's Temple in Biblical Historiography." *HTR* 83: 345–62.
- Kampen, John (1994). "The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT." In *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honour of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 86–97.
- Kampen, John (1999). "The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Kapelrud, A. S. (1963). "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings." *Orientalia* 32: 56–62.
- Käsemann, Ernst (1939). *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*. FRLANT 55. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Käsemann, Ernst (1984). *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Katz, Peter and Joseph Ziegler (1958). "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung." *VT* 8: 264–85.

- Kaufman, Stephen. A. (2005a). *Targum Chronicles: The Late Jewish Literary Aramaic Version of Chronicles from the Files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* (CAL). Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press.
- Kaufman, Stephen. A. (2005b). *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets: The Jewish Literary Aramaic Version of the Prophets from the Files of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* (CAL). Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press.
- Kearney, Peter J. (1977). "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40." *ZAW* 89: 375–87.
- Kee, H. C. (1983). "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 775–828.
- Kim, Lloyd (2006). *Polemic in the Book of Hebrews: Anti-Semitism, Anti-Judaism, Supersessionism?* Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick.
- Kinzer, Mark Stephen (1995). "'All Things Under His Feet': Psalm 8 in the New Testament and in Other Jewish Literature of Late Antiquity." PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- Kirschner, Robert (1985). "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70." *HTR* 78: 27–46.
- Kistemaker, S. J. (1961). *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: van Soest.
- Kistemaker, S. J. (1984). *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Klein, Ralph W. (2012). *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Kleinknecht, Hermann (1964). "The Greek Use of εἰκὼν." *TDNT* 2: 388–90.
- Klijn, A. Frederik J. (1983a). "2 (Syriac Apocalypse) of Baruch." *OTP* 1: 615–52.
- Klijn, A. Frederik J. (1983b). *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra*. TU 131. Berlin: Akademie (non vidi).
- Klijn, A. Frederik J. (1989). "Recent Developments in the Study of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *JSP* 4: 3–17.
- Kline, Meredith G. (1996) "Space and Time in Genesis Cosmogony." *Perspectives in Science and the Christian Faith* 48, <http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF3-96Kline.html>.
- Klinzing, Georg (1971). *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1976). "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *HeyJ* 17: 253–72.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1978). *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1979). "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25: 345–59.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1982). "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra." *JSJ* 13: 56–74.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1985). "Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah." *OTP* 2: 143–76.

- Knibb, Michael A. (1987). *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to 200 AD 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1995). "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls." *DSD* 2: 165–84.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1998). "Perspectives on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: The Levi Traditions." In *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: a Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort. VTSup 73. Leiden: Brill: 197–213.
- Knibb, Michael A. (2005). "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 213–19.
- Knibb, Michael A. (2007a). "The Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch? The Textual Evidence for 1 Enoch." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill: 21–40.
- Knibb, Michael A. (2007b). "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 48–64.
- Knibb, Michael A. (2007c). "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings from Before the Common Era." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 401–16.
- Knibb, Michael A. and R. J. Coggins (1979). *The First and Second Books of Esdras*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knohl, Israel (1996). "Between Voice and Silence: the Relationship between Prayer and the Temple Cult." *JBL* 115: 17–30.
- Knox, Wilfred L. (1948). "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament." *HTR* 41: 229–49.
- Koch, Klaus (2007). "Questions regarding the so-called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 228–37.
- Koester, Craig R. (1989). *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. CBQMS 22. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Koester, Craig R. (1994). "The Epistle to the Hebrews in Recent Study." *CBR* 2: 123–45.
- Koester, Craig R. (2001). *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday.
- Koester, Helmut (1962). "'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13:9–14." *HTR* 55: 299–315.

- Koester, Helmut (1972). "τόπος." *TDNT* 8: 187–208.
- Koester, Helmut (1972). "ὑπόστασις." *TDNT* 8: 572–89.
- Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham (1973). "The Assumption of Moses as a Testament." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 71–77.
- Kooij, Arie van der (2010). "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill: 55–71.
- Koosed, Jennifer L. and Robert P. Seesengood (2005). "Constructions and Collusions: The Making and Unmaking of Identity in Qoheleth and Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 265–80.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim (1988). *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim (1989). *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Krauter, Stephan (2007). "Die Beteiligung von Nichtjuden am Jerusalemer Tempelkult." In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World* Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Grintrop. Leiden: Brill: 55–74.
- Kristeva, Julia (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kugel, James (1993). "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *HTR* 86: 1–64.
- Kugel, James (1995). "The Ladder of Jacob." *HTR* 88: 209–27.
- Kugel, James (1997). *The Bible as It Was*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kugel, James (2006). *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and his Children*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kugler, Robert A. (1996). *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. SBLJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Kugler, Robert A. (2000). "Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 90–112.
- Kugler, Robert A. (2001). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang (1966). *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu*. SUNT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang (1994). "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefs aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the first Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 169–221.

- Kulik, Alexander (2004). *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*. SBLTCS. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kulik, Alexander (2010). *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*. CEJL. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. (1988). *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. (2004). "The Watcher Story and Genesis: An Intertextual Reading." *SJOT* 18: 163–83.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. (2007). "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 179–215.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. (2009). "Enochic Judaism—A Judaism without the Torah and the Temple?" In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 163–77.
- Laansma, Jon C. (1997). "I Will Give you Rest": *The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3–4*. WUNT 2, 98. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Laansma, Jon C. (2008a). "The Cosmology of Hebrews." In *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Edited by Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough. LNTS 355. London: T&T Clark: 125–43.
- Laansma, Jon C. (2008b). "Hidden Stories in Hebrews: Cosmology and Theology." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. LNTS 387. London: T&T Clark: 9–18.
- Laato, Antti (1998). "The Apocalypse of the Syriac Baruch and the Date of the End." *JSP* 18: 39–46.
- Lampe, G. W. H. (1984). "A.D. 70 in Christian Reflection." In *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*. Edited by E. Bammel and C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 153–71.
- Lanchester, H. C. O. (1913). "The Sibylline Oracles." *APOT* 2: 268–517.
- Lane, William L. (1985). "Hebrews: A Sermon in Search of a Setting." *SwJT* 28: 13–18.
- Lane, William L. (1991a). *Hebrews 1–8*. WBC 47A. Dallas: Word.
- Lane, William L. (1991b). *Hebrews 9–13*. WBC 47B. Dallas: Word.
- Lane, William R. (1959). "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium." *JBL* 78: 343–46.
- Lange, Armin (1995). *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill.
- Lange, Armin (2000). "The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature." In *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the*

- International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and E. M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill: 39–48.
- Lange, Armin (2008). "Your Daughters do not Give to their Sons and their Daughters do not Take for your Sons (Ezra 9,12). Teil 2, Inter marriage in Ezra 9–10 and in the Pre-Maccabean Dead Sea Scrolls." *BN* 139: 79–98.
- Langkammer, H. (1966). "'Den er zum Erben von allem *eingesetzt* hat' [Hebr 1,2]." *BZ* 10: 273–80.
- Langkammer, H. (1993). "πρωτότοκος." *EDNT* 3: 189–91.
- Laporte, Jean (1983). *Eucharistia in Philo*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 3. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
- Larcher, C. (1983). *Le Livre de la Sagesse, ou, La Sagesse de Salomon*. Paris: Gabalda.
- Larson, Erik (2000). "The Relation between the Greek and the Aramaic Texts of Enoch." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book: 434–44.
- Larson, Erik (2009). "Worship in Jubilees and Enoch." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 369–83.
- Lathey, C. (1942). "The Messianic Expectation in the 'Assumption of Moses'." *CBQ* 4: 11.
- Laurin, Robert B. (1958). "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'." *JSS* 3: 344–55.
- Leaney, A. R. C. (1966). *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. NTL. London: SCM.
- Lee, E. K. (1961). "Words Denoting 'Pattern' in the New Testament." *NTS* 8: 166–73.
- Lee, Pilchan (2001). *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: a Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*. WUNT 2, 129. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Leemhuis, Fred (1989). "The Arabic Version of the Apocalypse of Baruch: a Christian Text?" *JSP* 4: 19–26.
- Lehne, Susanne (1990). *The New Covenant in Hebrews*. JSNTSup 44. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Leithart, P. J. (2000). "Womb of the World: Baptism and the Priesthood of the New Covenant in Hebrews 10:19–22." *JSNT* 78: 49–65.
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta (2007). "Jewish Worship and Universal Identity in Philo of Alexandria." In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog. Leiden: Brill: 29–53.
- Leoni, Tommaso (2007). "'Against Caesar's wishes': Flavius Josephus as a Source for the Burning of the Temple." *JJS* 58: 39–51.

- Leschert, Dale F. (1994). *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*. NABPR Dissertation Series 10. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
- Leslau, Wolf (1991). *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English / English-Ge'ez with an Index of Semitic Roots*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Levenson, Jon D. (1984). "The Temple and the World." *JR* 64: 275–98.
- Levenson, Jon D. (1985). *Sinai and Zion*. Minneapolis: Winston.
- Levenson, Jon D. (1988a). *Creation and The Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Levenson, Jon D. (1988b). "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience." In *Jewish Spirituality: From The Bible Through The Middle Ages*. Edited by Arthur Green. World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of The Religious Quest 13. New York: Crossroad. 1: 32–61.
- Levey, Samson H. (1987). *The Targum of Ezekiel*. ArBib. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Levine, Lee I. (1994). "Josephus' Description of the Jerusalem Temple: War, Antiquities, and Other Sources." In *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers. StPB 41. Leiden: Brill: 233–46.
- Levine, Lee I. (2010a), "Jerusalem." *DEJ* 789–97.
- Levine, Lee I. (2010b), "Temple, Jerusalem." *DEJ* 1281–91.
- Levison, John R. (1988). *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: from Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short (1966). *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Licht, J. (1957). *The Thanksgiving Scroll*. Jerusalem: Bialik.
- Licht, J. (1961). "Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance." *JJS* 12: 95–103.
- Licht, J. (1965). מגילת הסרכים ממגילות מדבר יהודה [The Rule Scroll. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea] (*Hebrew*). Jerusalem: Bialik (*non vidi*).
- Licht, J. (1971). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *EncJud*. 2: 126–27.
- Licht, J. (1979). "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran. The Description of the New Jerusalem." *IEJ* 29: 45–59.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann (1980). *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*. SUNT 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann (1999). "Zion and the Destruction of the Temple in 4 Ezra 9–10." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 239–49.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg (2008). *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. JSJSup 129. Leiden: Brill.

- Lim, Timothy H. (1998). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden.*" *JNES* 57: 71–72.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. (1982). "Sabbath, Rest and Eschatology in the New Testament." In *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical Historical and Theological Investigation*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan: 197–220.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. (1990). *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. (2006). *Hebrews: a Guide*. London: T&T Clark.
- Lindars, Barnabas (1961). *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM.
- Lindars, Barnabas (1989). "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews." *NTS* 35: 382–406.
- Lindars, Barnabas (1991). *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lioy, Dan (2010). *Axis of Glory: A Biblical and Theological Analysis of the Temple Motif in Scripture*. StBibLit 138. New York: Lang.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh (1996). *Sophocles Fragments*. LCL 483. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Loader, William R. G. (1978). "Christ at the Right Hand: Ps cx. 1 in the New Testament." *NTS* 24: 199–217.
- Loader, William R. G. (1981). *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefs*. WMANT 53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Loader, William R. G. (2007). *Enoch, Levi and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes to Sexuality in the Early Enochic Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lohfink, Norbert (1969). *The Christian Meaning of the Old Testament*. London: Burns & Oates.
- Löhr, Hermut (2005). "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 199–210.
- Lohse, E. (1986). *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräische und Deutsch*. 4th ed. Munich: Kösel.
- Lombard, H. A. (1971). "Katápausis in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Neot* 5: 60–71.
- Long, Thomas (1997). *Hebrews*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. (1991). *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11*. JSNTSup. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. (1995). *2 Esdras*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. (1997). "Locating 4 Ezra: A Consideration of Its Social Setting and Functions." *JSJ* 28: 271–93.
- Longenecker, Richard N. (1975). *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Longenecker, Richard N. (1978). "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*. Edited by R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 161–85.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida (1988). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Lucas, Alec J. (2010). "Scripture Citations as an Internal Redactional Control: 1QS 5:1–20a and its 4Q Parallels." *DSD* 17: 30–52.
- Lucas, Ernest (1989). "The Origin of Daniel's Four Empires Scheme Re-examined." *TynBul* 40: 185–202.
- Lundquist, John M. (1983). "What is a Temple: a Preliminary Typology." In *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Edited by H. B. Huffmon, F. A. Spina and A. R. W. Green. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 205–19.
- Lunt, H. G. (1985). "The Ladder of Jacob: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 401–11.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie (2003). *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Lyons, W. J. and A. M. Reimer (1998). "The Demonic Virus and Qumran Studies: Some Preventative Measures." *DSD* 5: 16–32.
- Macaskill, Grant (2007). *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSup 115. Leiden: Brill.
- Macaskill, Grant (2012). "2 Enoch: Manuscripts, Recensions, and Original Language." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Associate Editor). *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill: 83–101.
- Mach, Michael (1992). *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Mach, Michael (2000). "From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism." In *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum. 1: 229–64.
- Mack, Burton L. (1985). *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mackie, Scott D. (2007). *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Mackie, Scott D. (2008). "Confession of the Son of God in the Exordium of Hebrews." *JSNT* 30: 437–53.
- Mackay, Peter W. (1990). *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 19. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
- MacRae, George W. (1978). "Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Semeia* 12: 179–99.

- Maher, Michael (1992). *The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Genesis*. ArBib 1B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Maier, Johann (1964). *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der "jüdischen Gnosis": Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabah*. Salzburg: Müller.
- Maier, Johann (1985). *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. JSOTSup 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Maier, Johann (1992). "Shîrê 'Ôlat hash-Shabbat. Some Observations on their Calendric Implications and on their Style." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid. 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11, 2. Leiden: Brill. 2: 543–60.
- Manson, William (1951). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Historical and Theological Reconsideration*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Mansoor, Menahem (1961). *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Marböck, J. (1971). *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*. BBB. Bonn: Hanstein.
- Marböck, J. (1981). "Henoch—Adam—der Thronwagen." *BZ* 25: 103–11.
- Marböck, J. (1999). "Der Hohepriester Simon in Sir 50: ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung von Priestertum und Kult im Sirachbuch." In *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom, Festschrift M. Gilbert*. Edited by N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen. Leuven: Leuven University Press: 215–29.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández (2000). *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill.
- Marguerat, Daniel (2007). "Jewish and Christian Understandings of the Fall of Jerusalem: Conflicting Interpretations of a Historical Event." In *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer. Leuven: Leuven University Press: 311–31.
- Martin, Matthew J. (2000). "The School of Virtue and the Tent of Zion: An Investigation into the Relationship Between the Institutions of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora Synagogue and the Jerusalem Temple in Late Second Temple Judaism: Philo of Alexandria—A Case Study." PhD Thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Martin, R. P. (1976). "ὑπόδειγμα." *NIDNTT* 2: 290–91.
- Mason, Eric F. (2008). *'You are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. STDJ 74. Leiden: Brill.
- Mason, Steve N. (2003). *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Mathewson, David (2003). "A Note on the Foundation Stones in Revelation 21.14, 19–20." *JSNT* 25: 487–98.
- Mayer, B. (1990). "ἐλπίς, κ.τ.λ." *EDNT* 1: 437–41.

- McCarter, P. Kyle Jr. (2000). "Geography in the Documents." *EDSS* 1: 306–8.
- McCullough, J. C. (1971). "Hebrews and the Old Testament." PhD Thesis, Queens University of Belfast.
- McKane, William (1998). *The Book of Micah: Introduction and Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- McKay, Kenneth L. (1994). *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek*. Studies in Biblical Greek. New York: Lang.
- McKelvey, R. J. (1969). *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKenzie, J. L. (1956). "Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28:12–18." *JBL* 75: 322–27.
- McKenzie, J. L. (1957). "Royal Messianism." *CBQ* 19: 25–52.
- McRay, John (1980). "Atonement and Apocalyptic in the Book of Hebrews." *ResQ* 23: 1–9.
- Meadowcroft, Tim (2006). *Haggai*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Phoenix.
- Mearns, Christopher L. (1979). "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch." *NTS* 25: 360–69.
- Meeham, Henry G. (1932). *The Oldest Version of the Bible: "Aristeus" on its Traditional Origin. A Study in Early Apologetic with Translation and Appendices*. London: Holborn.
- Meeks, Wayne A. (1968). "Moses as God and King." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill: 354–71.
- Meier, J. P. (1985a). "Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1–14." *Bib* 66: 168–89.
- Meier, J. P. (1985b). "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1,5–14." *Bib* 66: 504–33.
- Mendels, D. (1998). "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple." In *Identity, Religion and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History*. Edited by D. Mendels. JSPSup 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 365–78.
- Metso, Sarianna (1997). *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 26. Leiden: Brill.
- Metso, Sarianna (1998). "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule." In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 217–31.
- Metso, Sarianna (2007). *The Serekh Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; LSTS 62. London: T&T Clark.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1983). "The Fourth Book of Ezra with the Four Additional Chapters: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 516–59.

- Metzger, Bruce M. (1994). *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Meyer, M. (1997). "Mysteries." *DNTB* 720–25.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm (1967). "ὁδός, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 5: 42–114.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm (1968). "πρωτότοκος, πρωτοτόκια." *TDNT* 6: 871–81.
- Michaels, J. Ramsay (2009). "Hebrews." In *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews*. Edited by Linda Belleville, Jon C. Laamsma and J. Ramsay Michaels. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary 17. Carol Stream IL: Tyndale House.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey (1988). *1 Peter*. WBC 49. Dallas: Word.
- Michel, O. (1966). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 12 Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Michel, O. (1967). "οἰκουμένη." *TDNT* 5: 157–59.
- Michel, O. (1975). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 13 Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Milgrom, Jacob (1978). "The Temple Scroll." *BA* 41 (3): 105–20.
- Milgrom, Jacob (1993). "The Concept of Impurity in Jubilees and the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 16: 277–84.
- Milgrom, Jacob (2004). *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. CCS. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Milik, J. T. (1951). "Manuale Disciplinae." *VD* 29: 129–58.
- Milik, J. T. (1955a). "Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle (?)." In *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon: 134–35.
- Milik, J. T. (1955b). "Deux apocryphes en araméen." In *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon: 97–99.
- Milik, J. T. (1955c). "Le testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân (Pl. IV.)." *RB* 62: 398–406.
- Milik, J. T. (1955d). "Recueil des Bénédictiones." In *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon: 118–30.
- Milik, J. T. (1955e). "Testament de Lévi." In *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon: 87–91.
- Milik, J. T. (1955f). "Une apocryphe." In *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon: 101–2.
- Milik, J. T. (1962). "Textes de la Grotte 5Q." In *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*. Edited by. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon: 167–97.
- Milik, J. T. (1971). "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân." *HTR* 64: 333–78.
- Milik, J. T. (1972). "Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23: 95–144.
- Milik, J. T. (1976). *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Miller, James C. (2005). "Paul and Hebrews: A Comparison of Narrative Worlds." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 245–64.
- Miscall, Peter D. (1992). "Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book." In *Reading Between Texts*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell. Louisville: Westminster John Knox: 41–56.
- Mitchell, Alan C. (1992). "The Use of *πρέπειν* and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10." *CBQ* 54: 681–701.
- Mitchell, Alan C. (2007). *Hebrews*. SP 13. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Moberly, R. Walter L. (2009). "Exemplars of Faith in Hebrews 11: Abel." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 353–63.
- Moffatt, James A. (1924). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Moffitt, David M. (2011). *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NovTSup 141. Leiden: Brill.
- Momigliano, A. (1980). "La Forma Storica dei Vaticini sul Settimo Re nel Terzo Libro degli Oracoli sibillini." In *Sesto Contributo Alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Rome: Storia e Letteratura. 2: 551–59.
- Montefiore, H. A. (1964). *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: A&C Black.
- Moore, Nicholas J. (2014). "Jesus as 'The One who Entered his Rest': The Christological Reading of Hebrews 4.10." *JSNT* 36: 383–400.
- Morgan, Jonathan (2013). "The Vision of the Glory of God in the Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch)." *JSP* 22: 184–200.
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. (1992). "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *JJS* 43: 1–31.
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. (1993). "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1–12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources." *HTR* 86: 177–217.
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. (1998). "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources." In *SBLSP* 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1: 400–31.
- Mosser, Carl (2009a). "Rahab Outside the Camp." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 383–404.
- Mosser, Carl (2009b). "Review of Gabriella Gelardini, 'Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht': Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tischa be-Aw." *RBL*, [HTTP://www.bookreviews.org](http://www.bookreviews.org).
- Mosser, Carl (2013). "Torah Instruction, Discussion, and Prophecy in First-Century Synagogues." In *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary*

- Contexts for the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, and Andrew W. Pitts. TENT; Early Christianity in its Hellenistic Context 10.2. Leiden: Brill: 523–51.
- Motyer, Steve (2004). “The Temple in Hebrews: Is it There?” In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 177–89.
- Moulton, James Hope and G. Milligan (1930). *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Moulton, James Hope and Nigel Turner (1963). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Volume 3: Syntax by Nigel Turner*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Mowinkel, Sigmund (1966). *Psalmstudien, Buch II*. Amsterdam: Schippers.
- Muddiman, John (2007). “The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude.” In *The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude*. Edited by Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter. BZAW 372. Berlin: De Gruyter: 169–80.
- Mueller, James R. (1982). “The Apocalypse of Abraham and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple.” In *SBLSP 21*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 341–49.
- Mulder, Otto (2002). “Two Approaches: Simon the High Priest and YHWH God of Israel/God of All in Sirach 50.” In *Ben Sira’s God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham-Ushaw College, 2001*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: De Gruyter: 221–34.
- Mulder, Otto (2003). *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira’s Concept of the History of Israel*. JSJSup 78. Leiden: Brill.
- Müller, P.-G. (1990). “ἁρχηγός, κύ, ὁ.” *EDNT* 1: 163–64.
- Muntingh, L. M. (1971). “‘The City Which has Foundations,’ Heb. 11:8–10 in the Light of the Mari Texts.” In *De fructu oris sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus von Selms*. Edited by E. Y. Eybers, F. C. Fensham, C. B. Labuschagne, W. C. Van Wyk and A. H. Van Zyl. Leiden: Brill: 108–20.
- Muraoka, T. (2002). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: (Chiefly of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets)*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Murphy, Frederick James (1985a). “2 Baruch and the Romans.” *JBL* 104: 663–69.
- Murphy, Frederick James (1985b). *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. SBLDS 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Murphy, Frederick James (1987). “The Temple in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.” *JBL* 106: 671–83.
- Murphy, Frederick James (1993). *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, Frederick James (2010). “Biblical Antiquities (Pseudo-Philo).” *DEJ* 440–41.

- Murray, Oswyn (1975). "Aristeas and his Sources." *Studia Patristica* 12: 123–28.
- Murray, Oswyn (1987). "The Letter of Aristeas." *Studi ellenistici* 54: 15–29.
- Myers, J. M. (1974). *I & II Esdras*. AB 42. New York: Doubleday.
- Nairne, A. (1957). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CGTSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Najman, Hindy (2000). "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority." *DSD* 7: 313–33.
- Najman, Hindy (2003). *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill.
- Nauck, W. (1960). "Zum Aufbau des Hebräerbriefes." In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Walther Eltester. BZNW 26. Berlin: Töpelmann: 199–206.
- Nebe, G. Wilhelm (1998). "4Q174, 1–2, I, 6f im Lichte von Sektenschrift und Jub 2,22." *RevQ* 18: 581–87.
- Neusner, Jacob (1975). *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art*. SJLA. Leiden: Brill.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1980). "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment." *CBQ* 42: 310–29.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1985). *The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1987). "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot." *JJS* 38: 11–30.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1990a). "'He has Established for Himself Priests': Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot." In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 101–20.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1990b). "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the Maškil." In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 373–82.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1990c). "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." In *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*. Edited by William Henry Propp, Baruch Helpen and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 167–87.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1998). "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat." In *Qumran Cave 4: VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XI. Oxford: Clarendon: 173–401.
- Newsom, Carol A. (2000a), "Mysticism." *EDSS* 1: 591–94.
- Newsom, Carol A. (2000b), "Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *EDSS* 2: 887–89.
- Newsom, Carol A. (2003). "Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*." *DSD* 10: 431–35.
- Newsom, Carol A. (2004). *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill.
- Newsom, Carol A. (2010). "Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *DEJ* 1246–48.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1972). *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1973a). "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 33–37.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1973b). "Introduction." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 5–14.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1973c). "Narrative Traditions in the Paralipomena of Jeremiah and 2 Baruch." *CBQ* 35: 60–68.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1977). "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11." *JBL* 96: 383–405.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1978). "Reflections upon Reflections: A Response to John Collins' 'Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch'." In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtmeyer. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 1: 311–14.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1980). "Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. SBLSCS 12. Chico, CA: Scholars Press: 49–65.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1981a). "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100: 575–600.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1981b). *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1984a). "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 89–156.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1984b). "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 33–87.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2001). *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2003). "Response to Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel." In *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill. 2: 469–71.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2005). *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2006). *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. HTS 56. Expanded ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2007). "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 23–47.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam (2004). *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam (2012). *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin (1970). *La troisième Sibylle. Oracula sibyllina. Book 3*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin (1972). "Réflexions sur quelques problèmes du quatrième et du cinquième livre des Oracles Sibyllins." *HUCA* 43: 29–76.
- Ninow, Friedbert (2001). *Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif*. Friedensauer Schriftenreihe: Reihe A Theologie 4. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Nir, Rivka (2003). *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the "Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch"*. SBLJL 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1992). "Hymns from Qumran—4Q410–4Q511." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill: 53–63.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1994a). "4QBerakhot (4Q286–290): A Preliminary Report." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill: 53–71.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1994b). "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings From Qumran." *JQR* 85: 163–83.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1994c). *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1995). "4QBerakhot a–e (4Q286–290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts." *RevQ* 16: 487–506.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1998). "4QBerakhot." In *Qumran Cave 4: Poetical and Liturgical Texts Part 1*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XI. Oxford: Clarendon: 1–74.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (2000). "The Idea of Holiness in Qumran Poetry and Liturgy." In *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and E. M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill: 127–45.
- Noack, Bent (1963). "Are the Essenes Referred to in the Sibylline Oracles." *ST* 17: 90–102.
- Nolland, John (1978). "A Misleading Statement of the Essene Attitude to the Temple." *RevQ* 9: 555–62.
- Nolland, John (1979). "Sib Or 111: 265–94: An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle." *JTS* 30: 158–66.
- Nolland, John (1989). *Luke 1:7–9:20*. WBC 35A. Dallas: Word.
- Nolland, John (1993). *Luke 9:21–18:34*. WBC 35B. Dallas: Word.
- Nomoto, Shinya (1968). "Herkunft und Struktur der Hohenpriestervorstellung im Hebräerbrief." *NovT* 10: 10–25.

- O'Neill, J. C. (1991). "The Man from Heaven: SibOr 5:256–259." *JSP* 9: 87–102.
- O'Brien, Peter T. (2010). *The Letter to the Hebrews*. PNTC. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Oberholtzer, Thomas K. (1988). "The Kingdom Rest of Hebrews 3:1–4:13." *BSac* 145: 185–96.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. (2007). "'The Coming of the Righteous One' in Acts and 1 Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 250–59.
- Oepke, A. (1967). "ἐνίστημι." *TDNT* 2: 543–44.
- Olson, Daniel C. (1993). "Recovering the Original Sequence of 1 Enoch 91–93." *JSP* 6: 69–91.
- Olson, Daniel C. (2004). *Enoch: A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch. Translated with Annotations and Cross-References in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh*. North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal.
- Olyan, Saul M. (1987). "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood." *HTR* 80: 261–86.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2000). "The Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *JSJ* 31: 23–38.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2003a). "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants." *CBQ* 65: 184–201.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2003b). "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich." *JSJ* 34: 274–303.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2004a). "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture. Volume 2, Later Versions and Traditions*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London: T&T Clark. 2: 59–76.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2004b). "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *Hen* 26: 172–87.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2005a). *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2005b). "'Without Measure and Without Analogy': Shirur Qomah Traditions in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *JJS* 56: 224–44.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2007). "Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian." *Bib* 88: 153–73.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2008a). "'The Gods of my Father Terah': Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JSP* 18: 33–53.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2008b). "Praxis of the Voice: the Divine Name Tradition in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JBL* 127: 53–70.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2009a). "The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham." *CBQ* 71: 830–42.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2009b). *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. SVTP. Leiden: Brill.

- Orlov, Andrei A. (2012). "The Sacerdotal Traditions of 2 Enoch and the Date of the Text." In *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Associate Editor). Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill: 102–16.
- Osborne, Grant O. (1975). "Soteriology in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Grace Unlimited*. Edited by Clark H. Pinnock. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship.
- Osty, Emile (1957). *Le Livre de la Sagesse*. La Sainte Bible. 2nd ed., revue. Paris: Cerf.
- Oswalt, John N. (1986). *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Oswalt, John N. (2002). "נִדּוֹת etc." *NIDOTTE* 3: 56–59.
- Otzen, Benedikt (1984). "Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function." In *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*. Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer. JSOTSup 31. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 199–215.
- Owen, John (1854). *The Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with Preliminary Exercitations*. The Works of John Owen 19. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter.
- Parry, D. W. (1994). "Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary." In *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*. Edited by D. W. Parry. Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret: 126–51.
- Patai, Raphael (1967). *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*. 2nd ed. New York: KTAV.
- Pate, C. Marvin (2000). *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Pattemore, Stephen W. (2004). *The People of God in the Apocalypse: Discourse, Structure and Exegesis*. SNTSMS 128. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patton, Corinne (2000). "Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*." *JBL* 119: 560–61.
- Pearson, Birger A. (1998). "Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, Gnosticism." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International: 176–202.
- Peeler, Amy L. B. (2014). *You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. LNTS 486. London: T&T Clark.
- Pelletier, A. (1962). *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, index complet di mots grecs*. SC 89. Paris: Le Cerf (*non vidi*).
- Penner, Ken M. and David M. Miller (2006). "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch." In *The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by Ken M. Penner, David M. Millar and Ian. W. Scott. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. Online: <http://ocp.stfx.ca/>
- Pennington, A. (1984). "The Apocalypse of Abraham." In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 363–91.

- Perdue, Leo G. (1977). *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literatures of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. SBLDS 30. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Perdue, Leo G. (1994). *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of the Wisdom Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Perkins, Larry J. (2007). "Exodus." In *NETS*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Electronic ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 43–81.
- Perrot, Charles, Pierre Bogaert, Jacques Cazeaux and Daniel J. Harrington (1976). *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*. SC 229, 230. Paris: Cerf.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard (2007). "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill: 285–306.
- Petersen, David L. (1985). *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8: A Commentary*. London: SCM.
- Peterson, David G. (1982). *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in "The Epistle to the Hebrews"*. SNTSMS 47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfann, Stephen J. (2000). "Cryptic texts." In *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann. Oxford: Clarendon: 515–702.
- Philo (1929–1962). *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Picard, J.-C. (1970). "Observations sur l'apocalypse grecque de Baruch." *Semitica* 20: 77–103.
- Picard, J.-C., ed. (1967). "Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece." In *Testamentum Iobi, Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*. PVTG 2. Leiden: Brill: 81–96.
- Pietersma, Albert (2009). "Psalms." In *NETS*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Electronic ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 542–620.
- Plutarch (1927–1976). *Plutarch's Moralia*. LCL. London: Heinemann.
- Poirier, John (2004). "The Ouranology of the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JSJ* 35: 391–408.
- Porter, Paul A. (1983). *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8*. CB Old Testament Series 20. Lund: Gleerup.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1993). *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek 1. New York: Lang.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1994a). "The Date of Composition of Hebrews and Use of the Present Tense Form." In *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in honour of Michael D. Goulder*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce and David E. Orton. BibInt 8. Leiden: Brill: 295–313.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1994b). *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Priest, John F. (1962). "Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiah." *JBL* 81: 55–61.

- Priest, John F. (1983). "Testament of Moses: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 919–34.
- Prinsloo, W. S. (1995). "Psalm 95: If Only You Will Listen to His Voice!" In *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*. Edited by M. Daniel Carroll R., David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. JSOTSup 200. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 393–410.
- Propp, William H. C. (1998). *Exodus 1–18*. AB 2. New York: Doubleday.
- Puech, Émile (1987). "Review of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*." *RB* 94: 604–13.
- Puech, Émile (1992). "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi c–d(?) et 4QAJa." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid. 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11, 2. Leiden: Brill. 2: 449–501.
- Puech, Émile (1993). *La croyance des Esseniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien*. EB 21, 22. Paris: Gabalda.
- Puech, Émile (1995). "À propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle d'après les manuscrits de la Mer Morte." *Semitica* 43–44: 87–102.
- Puech, Émile (2008). "Les identités en présence dans les scènes du jugement dernier de 4QInstruction (4Q416 1 et 4Q418 69 11)." In *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill: 147–73.
- Puech, Émile (2009). *Qumrân Grotte 4.27: Textes Araméens, Deuxième Partie*. DJD xxxvii. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Qimron, Elisha (1986). *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Qimron, Elisha (1995). "The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 2: 295–329.
- Qimron, Elisha (1996). *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. JDS. Jerusalem: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press/Israel Exploration Society.
- Qimron, Elisha and James H. Charlesworth (1994a). "Cave IV Fragments." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 53–104.
- Qimron, Elisha and James H. Charlesworth (1994b). "Rule of the Community." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 1–51.
- Rahlfs, A. (1931). *Psalmi cum Odis. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum X*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Rahlfs, A. (1935). *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
- Rajak, Tessa (1983). *Josephus: The Historian and his Society*. London: Duckworth.
- Rajak, Tessa (2009). *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rappaport, Uriel (2012). "The *Letter of Aristeas* Again." *JSP* 21: 285–303.
- Ravid, Liora (2002). "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." *JSP* 13: 61–86.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko (2004). "Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 Enoch 6–16." In *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by R. S. Boustani and A. Y. Reed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 47–66.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko (2005). *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Reese, James M. (1965). "Plan and structure in the Book of Wisdom." *CBQ* 27: 391–99.
- Reese, James M. (1970). *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences*. AnBib 41. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Reid, Patrick V. (1987). *Readings in Western Religious Thought: The Ancient World*. New York: Paulist.
- Reider, Joseph and Nigel Turner (1966). *An Index to Aquila: Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*. VTSup 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Reymond, Eric D. (2014). *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. RBS. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Reynolds, Noel B., Donald W. Parry, E. Jan Wilson and Steven W. Booras (1998). "Dead Sea Scrolls on CD. Leiden: Brill.
- Rhee, Victor (Sung-Yul) (2001). *Faith in Hebrews: Analysis within the Context of Christology, Eschatology and Ethics*. StBibLit. New York: Lang.
- Rhoads, David M. (1973). "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History 4 B. C.–A. D. 48." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 53–58.
- Rice, George E. (1987). "Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of Some Assumptions concerning *Katapetasma*." *AUSS* 25: 65–71.
- Richardson, Christopher A. (2012). *Pioneer and Perfector of Faith: Jesus' Faith as the Climax of Israel's History in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 3, 228. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Rickenbacher, Otto (1973). *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira*. OBO 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ringgren, Helmer (1995). *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christian Origins Library. Expanded ed. Edited with a New Introduction by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad.
- Rissi, Mathias (1987). *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser*. WUNT 41. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Robertson, A. T. (1914). *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Robinson, Edward (1876). *A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New and improved ed. Revised by Alexander Negris and John Duncan. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Roddy, Nicolae (1996). "Two Parts, Weeks of Seven Weeks': The End of the Age as Terminus ad Quem for 2 Baruch." *JSP* 14: 3–14.
- Rogers, Jessie (2004). "It Overflows like the Euphrates with Understanding': Another Look at the Relationship between Law and Wisdom in Sirach." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London: T&T Clark. 1: 114–21.
- Rooke, D. W. (2000). *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Wolter H. (2000). *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*. JSOTSup 304. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Roth, Cecil (1960). "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis." *VT* 10: 51–68.
- Rothschild, Clare K. (2009). *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 235. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Rowland, Christopher (1979). "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature." *JSJ* 10: 137–54.
- Rowland, Christopher (1982). *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- Rowland, Christopher (1984). "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition." *NTS* 30: 498–507.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. and H. G. Lunt (1983). "The Apocalypse of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 681–705.
- Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van (1999a). "Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*." In *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Leiden: Brill: 63–94.
- Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van (1999b). "Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 215–27.
- Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van (2000). *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 66. Leiden: Brill.
- Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van (2007). "The Four Rivers of Eden in the Apocalypse of Paul (Visio Pauli). The Intertextual Relationship of Genesis 2.10–14 and the Apocalypse of Paul 23." In *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Istvan Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters: 50–76.

- Runia, David T. (1993). *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. CRINT III 3. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Russell, Brian D. (2007). *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1–21*. StBibLit 101. New York: Lang.
- Sabourin, Leopold (1973). *Priesthood: A Comparative Study*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sacchi, Paolo (1990). *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Sacchi, Paolo (2005). "History of the Earliest Enochic Texts." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 401–407.
- Sacchi, Paolo (2006). "Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch." In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press. 2: 377–95.
- Salevao, Iutesone (2002). *Legitimation in the Letter to the Hebrews: The Construction and Maintenance of a Symbolic Universe*. JSNTSup 219. London: Sheffield Academic.
- Sanders, E. P. (1985a). *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Sanders, E. P. (1985b). *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM.
- Sanders, E. P. (1992). *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63BCE–66CE*. London: SCM.
- Sanders, Jack T. (1971). *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*. SNTSMS 15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, Jack T. (1983). *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom*. SBLMS 28. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Saylor, Gwendolyn B. (1984). *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. SBLDS 72. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Schäfer, Peter (1978). *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums*. AGJU 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Schäfer, Peter (1981). *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* TSAJ 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schäfer, Peter (1992). *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schäfer, Peter (2009). *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schaff, Philip (1969). *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Christian Fathers of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace (1952). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Christian Fathers: Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. A Select Library of the Christian Church: Second Series 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (1997). "Keeping his Appointment: Creation and Enthronement in Hebrews." *JSNT* 66: 91–117.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (2001). "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1." *JBL* 120: 469–85.

- Schenck, Kenneth L. (2002). "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews: Ronald Williamson's Study after Thirty Years." In *The Studia Philonica Annual. Volume 14*. Edited by David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling. Atlanta: Scholars Press: 112–40.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (2003). *Understanding the Book of Hebrews: The Story Behind the Sermon*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (2005). *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (2007). *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*. SNTSMS 143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schenk, Wolfgang (1980). "Hebräerbrief 4.14–16. Textlinguistik als Kommentierungsprinzip." *NTS* 26: 242–52.
- Schierse, Franz-Josef (1955). *Verheissung und Heilsvollendung: Zur theologischen Grundfrage des Hebraerbriefs*. Munich: Zink.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1985). "Purity and Perfection: Exclusion from the Council of the Community in the Serekh Ha-'Edah." In *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the First International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*. Edited by Avraham Biran. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society: 373–89.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1987). "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy." In *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: ASOR: 33–48.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1989). *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1992). "The Furnishings of the Temple According to the Temple Scroll." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid. 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrerra and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11,2. Leiden: Brill. 2: 621–34.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1994). "The Theology of the Temple Scroll." *JQR* 85: 109–23.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1996). "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai. Kampen: Kok Pharos: 72–88.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1999). "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 267–84.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (2000). "Rule of the Congregation." *EDSS* 2: 797–99.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (2001). "Descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and the Temple Scroll." In *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 27–31

- January, 1999*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill: 69–82.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (2009). "Temple, Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill: 165–76.
- Schippers, R. (1986). "τέλος." *NIDNTT* 2: 59–65.
- Schlier, Heinrich (1964). δέικνυμι, κ.τ.λ. *TDNT* 2: 25–33.
- Schmidt, Francis (2001). *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Israel*. The Biblical Seminar 78. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Schofield, Alison (2008). "Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 Serekh Copies." *DSD* 15: 96–120.
- Scholem, Gershom G. (1946). *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. 3rd revised ed. New York: Schocken Books.
- Scholer, John M. (1991). *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Schreiber, Stefan (2001). "Hoffnung Und Handlungsperspektive in Der Assumptio Mosis." *JSJ* 32: 252–71.
- Schreiner, Johannes (1961). "Führung—Thema der Heilsgeschichte im Alten Testament." *BZ* 5: 2–18.
- Schreiner, Johannes (2002). *Jesus Sirach 1–24*. Die Neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg: Echter.
- Schuller, E. M. (2000). "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 29–45.
- Schultz, Joseph P. (1971). "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law." *JQR* 61: 282–307.
- Schürer, Emil, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman (1973–1987). *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Rev. ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. (1979). "The Three Temples of 4 Q Florilegium." *RevQ* 10: 83–91.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. (1980). "The tribes of As. Mos. 4:7–9." *JBL* 99: 217–23.
- Schwartz, Seth (1990). *Josephus and Judean Politics*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition. Leiden: Brill.
- Schwemer, Anna Maria (1991). "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran." In *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 45–118.
- Schwemer, Anna Maria (1995). *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Propheten Legenden Vitae Prophetarum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Scott, James M. (2005). *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 91. Leiden: Brill.

- Segal, Alan F. (1986). *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Segal, Michael (2007). *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon (1961). *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. London: MacMillan.
- She, King L. (2011). *The Use of Exodus in Hebrews*. StBibLit 142. New York: Lang.
- Shea, William H. (1989). "The Significance and Function of Ton Hagion in Hebrews 8–10. Unpublished Paper collected by the Centre for Adventist Research (*non vidi*).
- Shemesh, Aharon (2009). "4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 247–60.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. (1980). *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. BZAW 151. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Shutt, R. J. H. (1985). "The Letter of Aristeeas." *OTP* 2: 7–34.
- Silva, Moises (1976). "Perfection and Eschatology in Hebrews." *WTJ* 39: 60–71.
- Simon, Marcel (1983). "Sur quelques aspects des Oracles Sibyllins juifs." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 219–33.
- Simpson, E. K. (1946). "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *EvQ* 18: 187–90.
- Skehan, Patrick W. (1963). "New Translation of Qumran Texts." *CBQ* 25: 119–23.
- Skehan, Patrick W. (1971). "The Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13–30." *HTR* 64: 387–400.
- Skehan, Patrick W. (1979). "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24." *CBQ* 41: 365–79.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella (1987). *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday.
- Skelton, David A. (2009). "Ben Sira's Imaginative Theodicy: Reflections on the Aaronide Priesthood under Gentile Rule." *ResQ* 51: 1–12.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon (1977). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. SBLMS 21. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon (1984). "The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JBL* 103: 531–37.
- Smend, R. (1906). *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebräisch und Deutsch*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Smillie, Gene R. (2004). "The One who is Speaking' in Heb 12:25." *TynBul* 55: 275–94.
- Smith, Jerome (1969). *A Priest Forever: A Study of Typology and Eschatology in Hebrews*. London: Sheed & Ward.
- Smith, Ralph L. (1984). *Micah-Malachi*. WBC 32. Waco, TX: Word.
- Snaith, John G. (1974). *Ecclesiasticus*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sommer, Benjamin D. (1998). *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Contraversions: Jews and other Differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Son, Kiwoong (2005). *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18–24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle*. PBM. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Sowers, Sidney G. (1965). *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Basel Studies of Theology 1. Richmond, VA: John Knox.
- Spatafora, Andrea (1997). *From the 'Temple of God' to God as Temple: A Biblical and Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* TGST. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Sperber, Alexander (2004). *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts, Volumes 1–3: The Pentateuch according to the Targum Onkelos; the Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan, the Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*. 3rd Impression. Leiden: Brill.
- Spicq, Ceslas (1952). *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 3rd ed. Paris: Gabalda.
- Spilsbury, Paul (2001). "Josephus." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Vol. 1, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid. WUNT 2. Reihe 2/140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 241–60.
- Spilsbury, Paul (2002). "Josephus on the Burning of the Temple, the Flavian Triumph, and the Providence of God." In *SBLSP 41*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature: 306–27.
- Stanley, Christopher D. (1992). *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stanley, Steve (1994). "The Structure of Hebrews from Three Perspectives." *TynBul* 45: 245–71.
- Stanley, Steve (1995). "Hebrews 9:6–10: The 'Parable' of the Tabernacle." *NovT* 37: 385–99.
- Stegemann, Ekkehard W. and W. Stegemann (2005). "Does the Cultic Language in Hebrews Represent Sacrificial Metaphors? Reflections on Some Basic Problems." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods—New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill: 13–23.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (1987). "Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah—Lost for 2,500 Years?" *BAR* 13 (6): 28–35.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (1988). "The Origins of the Temple Scroll." In *Congress Volume Jerusalem, 1986*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. Leiden: Brill: 235–56.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (1992). "The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Leiden: Brill: 156–85.

- Stegemann, Hartmut (1996). "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism." *RevQ* 17: 479–505.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (2000). "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947–1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: 272–84.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (2003). "The Number of Psalms in 1QHODAYOTa and some of their Sections." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion center, 19–23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill: 191–234.
- Stelten, Leo F. (1995). *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin: With an Appendix of Latin Expressions Defined and Clarified*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Sterling, Gregory E. (2001). "Ontology Versus Eschatology: Tensions Between Author and Community in Hebrews." In *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism. Volume 13*. Edited by David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies: 190–211.
- Steudel, Annette (1994). *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill.
- Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan (2000). "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21–32." *JSP* 11: 27–58.
- Stone, Michael E. (1976). "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." In *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke and P. D. Miller. Garden City, NY: Doubleday: 414–52.
- Stone, Michael E. (1978). "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." *CBQ* 40: 479–92.
- Stone, Michael E. (1981). "Reactions to the Destructions of the Second Temple." *JSJ* 12: 195–204.
- Stone, Michael E. (1984). "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. CRINT II 2. Assen: Van Gorcum: 383–441.
- Stone, Michael E. (1988). "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins." *JSJ* 19: 159–70.
- Stone, Michael E. (1989). *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra*. HSS. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Stone, Michael E. (1990). *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

- Stone, Michael E. (1993). "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam And Eve." *JTS* 44: 143–56.
- Stone, Michael E. (2003). "Aramaic Levi Document and Greek Testament of Levi." In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill: 429–37.
- Stone, Michael E. (2007). "The City in 4 Ezra." *JBL* 126: 402–7.
- Stone, Michael E. and Jonas C. Greenfield (1993). "The Prayer of Levi." *JBL* 112: 247–66.
- Stordalen, T. (2000). *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Strack, H. L. and G. Stemmerger (1992). *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck (1924). *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Die Briefe Des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis erläutert aus talmud und Midrasch, Dritter Band. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Strobel, August (1991). *Der Brief an die Habräer*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Strugnell, John (1960). "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4Q Serek Šîrôt 'Ólat Haššabbat." In *Congress Volume Oxford 1959*. Edited by G. W. Anderson. VTSup 7. Leiden: Brill: 318–45.
- Strugnell, John (1969–71). "Notes en marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7: 163–276.
- Strugnell, John and D. J. Harrington (1999). "Instruction." In *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts Part 2*. Edited by Emmanuel Tov. DJD XXXIV. Oxford: Clarendon: 1–503.
- Stuart, Douglas K. (1987). *Hosea-Jonah*. WBC 31. Dallas: Word.
- Stuart, Douglas K. (2006). *Exodus*. NAC 2. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (1995). *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2, 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (1999). "Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*." *JTS* 50: 658–64.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2000). "4QEnochGiants^a ar." In *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Edited by Emmanuel Tov. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon: 8–41.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2004). "'Angels' and 'God': Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and W. E. S. North. JSNTSup 263. New York: Continuum: 45–70.

- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2007). *1 Enoch 91–108*. CEJL. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Sukenik, E. (1955). *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Sullivan, Kevin P. (2004). *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship Between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. AGJU 55. Leiden: Brill.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. (1959). "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community: A Note on 1QS 8: I ff." *JSS* 4: 134–38.
- Suter, David W. (1979a). "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16." *HUCA* 50: 115–35.
- Suter, David W. (1979b). *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. SBLDS 47. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Suter, David W. (1981). "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion." *RSR* 7: 217–21.
- Suter, David W. (2002). "Revisiting Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest." *Hen* 24: 137–42.
- Suter, David W. (2007). "Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch Tradition: Memory, Vision and Expectation." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill: 195–218.
- Suter, David W. (2009). "Jubilees, the Temple, and the Aaronite Priesthood." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 397–410.
- Svendsen, Stefan Nordgaard (2009). *Allegory Transformed: The Appropriation of Philonic Hermeneutics in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 269. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Swanson, Dwight D. (1995). *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of nQT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: Brill.
- Sweet, J. P. M. (1984). "The Assumption of Moses." In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 601–16.
- Swetnam, James (1969). "On the Literary Genre of the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews." *NovT* 11: 261–69.
- Swetnam, James (1970). "Hebrews 9:2 and the Uses of Consistency." *CBQ* 32: 205–21.
- Swetnam, James (1972). "Form and Content in Hebrews 1–6." *Bib* 53: 368–85.
- Swetnam, James (1974). "Form and Content in Hebrews 7–13." *Bib* 55: 333–48.
- Swetnam, James (1981). *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah*. AnBib 94. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Synge, F. C. (1959). *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. London: SPCK.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu (1953). "The Sectarian סֵפֶר: A Biblical Noun." *VT* 3: 133–40.
- Tate, Marvin E. (1990). *Psalms 51–100*. WBC 20. Dallas: Word.
- Tcherikover, Victor (1958). "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristaeas." *HTR* 51 (2): 59–86.
- Tengström, S. and H.-J. Fabry (1980). "חֲלֵי." *TDOT* 4: 432–35.
- Terrien, Samuel (1970). "The Omphalos Myth and Hebrew Religion." *VT* 20 (3): 315–38.

- Thackeray, Henry St. John (1914). "Appendix: The Letter of Aristeas." In *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Edited by H. B. Swete. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 531–606.
- Thayer, J. H. (1898). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Translated, Revised and Enlarged*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark.
- Theissen, G. (1969). *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*. SNT 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Thiering, B. E. (1981). "Mebaqquer and Episkopos in the Light of the Temple Scroll." *JBL* 100: 59–74.
- Thiering, B. E. (1989). "The Date of the Composition of the Temple Scroll." In *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 99–120.
- Thistleton, Anthony C. (2000). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Thomas, K. J. (1965). "The Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 11: 303–25.
- Thompson, James W. (1976). "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5–13." *CBQ* 38: 352–63.
- Thompson, James W. (1982). *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CBQMS 13. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association.
- Thompson, James W. (2008). *Hebrews*. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Thyen, Hartwig (1955). *Der Stil der Jüdische-Hellenistischen Homilie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Tiede, David L. (1973). "The Figure of Moses in *The Testament of Moses*." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 4. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature: 86–92.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (1996). *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of the Watchers and Apocalyptic*. OtSt 35. Leiden: Brill.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (2000a). "The Addressees of 4QInstruction." In *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill: 62–75.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (2000b). "A Newly Identified 11Q^{Serekh} ha-Yaḥad Fragment (11Q29)?" In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book: 285–92.

- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (2001). *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (2002a). "Some Remarks on The Book of Watchers, The Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208." *Hen* 24: 143–45.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (2002b). "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)." In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters: 99–126.
- Tiller, Patrick A. (1993). *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. SBLEJL 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Tobin, Thomas H. (1983). *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQMS 14. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Tov, Emmanuel and Stephen J. Pfann (1993). *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*. Leiden: Brill.
- Traub, Helmut (1967). "οὐρανός, οὐράνιος, ἐπουράνιος, οὐρανόθεν." *TDNT* 5: 497–543.
- Tromp, Johannes (1993). *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. SVTP. Leiden: Brill.
- Trudinger, L. Paul (1982). "The Gospel Meaning of the Secular: Reflections on Hebrews 13:10–13." *EvQ* 54: 235–37.
- Tucker, Gene M. (2001). "The Book of Isaiah 1–39: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections." In *NIB*. Edited by Leander Keck. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Turdeanu, Émile (1968). "Une Curiosité de l'Hénoch Slave: les phénix du sixième ciel." *Revue des Etudes Slaves* 47: 54–54.
- Turdeanu, Émile (1972). "L'Apocalypse D'Abraham En Slave." *JSJ* 3: 153–80.
- Tzoref, Shani (2009). "Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions." *DSD* 16: 190–220.
- Ullman-Margalit, Edna (2006). *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Enquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vaganay, L. (1940). "Le plan de l'épître aux Hébreux." In *Mémorial Lagrange*. Paris. Gabalda: 269–77.
- Vaillant, A. (1952). *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- VanderKam, James C. (1973). "The Theophany of Enoch I 3b-7, 9." *VT* 23: 129–50.
- VanderKam, James C. (1977). *Textual and Historical Studies on the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- VanderKam, James C. (1984a). *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- VanderKam, James C. (1984b). "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10, 91:11–17)." *CBQ* 46: 511–23.
- VanderKam, James C. (1987). "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch." In *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas*

- O. Lambdin*. Edited by David M. Golomb, with the assistance of Susan T. Hollis. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns: 247–62.
- VanderKam, James C. (1988). "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran." *RevQ* 13: 353–65.
- VanderKam, James C. (1992). "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity; the First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, J. Brownson, M. T. Davis, S. J. Kraftchick and A. F. Segal. Philadelphia: Fortress: 169–91.
- VanderKam, James C. (1994). "The Theology of the Temple Scroll: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman." *JQR* 87: 129–35.
- VanderKam, James C. (1995a). *Enoch a Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- VanderKam, James C. (1995b). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *CBQ* 57: 576–77.
- VanderKam, James C. (2001). "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch." In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 129–48.
- VanderKam, James C. (2002). "Viewed from Another Angle: Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." *JSP* 13: 209–15.
- VanderKam, James C. (2004). *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- VanderKam, James C. (2008). "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees." *CBR* 6: 405–31.
- VanderKam, James C. (2009). "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 3–21.
- VanderKam, James C. (2010a). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- VanderKam, James C. (2010b). "Judaism in the Land of Israel." *DEJ* 57–76.
- VanderKam, James C. and J. T. Milik (1991). "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication" *JBL* 110: 243–70.
- VanderKam, James C. and J. T. Milik (1994). "Jubilees." In *Qumran Cave 4: VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by James C. VanderKam. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1963). *La Structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1964). "L'οἰκουμένη dans l'épître aux Hébreux." *Bib* 45: 248–53.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1965). "'Par la tente plus grande et plus parfait . . .' (He 9,11)." *Bib* 46: 1–28.

- Vanhoye, Albert (1969). *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1–2*. LD 58. Paris: Cerf.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1971). "Trois ouvrages récents sur l'épître aux Hébreux." *Bib* 51: 62–71.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1976). *La Structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux*. 2nd ed. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1977). "La Question Littéraire de Hébreux xiii. 1–6." *NTS* 23: 121–39.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1989). *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1996). "La 'teleiôsis' du Christ: Point capital de la Christologie sacerdotale d'Hébreux." *NTS* 42: 321–38.
- Vattioni, Francesco (1968). *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, Latina e Siriaca*. Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli.
- Vermes, Geza (1961). *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Vermes, Geza (1986). "Jewish Literature Composed in Hebrew or Aramaic." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, Volume III 1. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 177–469.
- Vermes, Geza and Martin Goodman (1987). "Jewish Literature of which the Original Language is Uncertain." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, Volume III 2. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 705–808.
- Vermeylen, Jacques (2007). *Jérusalem centre du monde: Développements et contestations d'une tradition biblique*. Lectio Divina. Paris: Cerf.
- Vincent, R. P. H. (1909). "Jérusalem d'après la lettre d'Aristée." *RB* 5: 555–75.
- Vogel, Manuel (1999). "Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 251–63.
- von Rad, G. (1966). *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Vorster, Willem S. (1989). "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Edited by Sipke Draisma. Kampen: Kok: 15–26.
- Wacholder, B. Z. (1983). *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. HUCM 8. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Walker, Peter W. L. (1994). "Jerusalem in Hebrews 13:9–14 and the Dating of the Epistle." *TynBul* 45: 39–71.
- Walker, Peter W. L. (1996). *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Walker, Peter W. L. (2000). "The Land in the Apostles' Writings." In *The Land of Promise*. Edited by Peter W. L. Walker and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove IL: IVP: 81–99.
- Walker, Peter W. L. (2004). "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon." In *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday*. Edited by P. J. Williams, Andrew D. Clarke, Peter M. Head and David Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 231–49.
- Wallace, Daniel B. (1996). *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Wallace, David (2003). "The Use of Psalms in the Shaping of a Text: Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 110:1 in Hebrews 1." *ResQ* 56: 41–50.
- Waltke, Bruce K. (2007). *A Commentary on Micah*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Cathi J. Fredricks (2001). *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor (1990). *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Walton, J. H. (1995). "The Mesopotamian Background of the Tower of Babel Account and Its Implications." *BBR* 5: 155–75.
- Walton, J. H. (2001). *Genesis*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Walton, J. H. (2006). *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Wardle, Timothy (2010). *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. WUNT 2, 291. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wassen, Cecilia (2007). "Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings—Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: De Gruyter: 499–523.
- Wassen, Cecilia (2008). "What Do Angels Have Against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz. Minneapolis: Fortress: 115–29.
- Wasserstein, Abraham and David Wasserstein (2006). *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, John D. W. (1957). "The Song of the Sea: Ex. xv." *VT* 7: 371–80.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. (2004). "The 'Letter' to the Hebrews and its Thirteenth Chapter." *NTS* 50: 390–405.
- Weinfeld, Moshe (1972). *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Weinfeld, Moshe (1981). "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3." In *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Delcor. AOAT 212. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker: 501–12.

- Weinfeld, Moshe (1983). "The Heavenly Praise in Unison." In *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift Für Georg Molin Zu Seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by I. Seybold. Graz: Akademische Druck.
- Weiser, Artur (1962). *The Psalms: A Commentary*. London: SCM.
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich (1991). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, Herold (1996). "Sabbatismos in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *CBQ* 58: 674–89.
- Weitzman, Steven (1994). "The Song of Abraham." *HUCA* 65: 21–33.
- Wendland, Paul (1900). *Aristeae Ad Philocratem epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Wenham, Gordon J. (1986). "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story." In *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies: 19–25.
- Wenthe, Dean O. (1998). "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM." *DSD* 5: 290–319.
- Wentling, Judith L. (1989). "Unraveling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *RevQ* 14: 61–73.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. (1957). *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Westcott, B. F. (1892). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long (2000). "Moses and Hebrews 3:1–6: Approach or Avoidance?" In *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic: 175–201.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long (2005). *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. LNTS 297. London: T&T Clark.
- Wevers, John William (1974). *Genesis*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William (1977). *Deuteronomium*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum III, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William (1978). *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. MSU 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William (1982). *Numeri*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum III, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William (1990). *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SBLSCS 40. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wevers, John William (1991). *Exodus*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum II, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wevers, John William (1995). *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBLSCS 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wheeler-Robinson, H. (1944). "The Council of Yahweh." *JTS* 45: 151–57.
- White, L. Michael (2015). "Epistolarity, Exhortation and Apologetics in the Epistle of Aristeas." *Early Christianity* 6: 179–219.

- Whitters, Mark F. (2003). *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. JSPSup 42. London: Sheffield Academic.
- Wikgren, Allen (1960). "Patterns of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 6: 159–67.
- Wildberger, Hans (1991). *Isaiah 1–12*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wildberger, Hans (1997). *Isaiah 13–27*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Willett, Tom W. (1989). *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. JSPSup 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Wiley, Patricia Tull (1997). *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. SBLDS 161. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Williams, Clarence R. (1911). "A Word-Study of Hebrews 13." *JBL* 30: 129–36.
- Williamson, Ronald (1963). "Platonism and Hebrews." *SJT* 16: 415–24.
- Williamson, Ronald (1970). *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ALGHJ 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Williamson, Ronald (1975). "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 21: 300–312.
- Wills, Lawrence M. (1984). "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity." *HTR* 77: 277–99.
- Wilson, Andrew M. and Lawrence M. Wills (1982). "Literary sources of the Temple Scroll." *HTR* 73: 275–88.
- Wilson, James P. (1939). "The Interpretation of Hebrews xiii. 10." *ExpTim* 50: 380–81.
- Wilson, R. McL. (1987). *Hebrews*. Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.
- Windisch, Hans (1913). *Der Hebräerbrief*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Winston, David (1979). *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Wintermute, O. S. (1985). "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 35–142.
- Wise, Michael O. (1989). "The Covenant of Temple Scroll xxix, 3–10." *RevQ* 14: 49–60.
- Wise, Michael O. (1990a). *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 59. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Wise, Michael O. (1990b). "The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll." *JNES* 49: 155–72.
- Wise, Michael O. (1991). "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *RevQ* 15: 103–32.
- Wise, Michael O. (1994). "That Which Has Been is That Which Shall Be: 4QFlorilegium and the *מקדש אדם*." In *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. Edited by Michael O. Wise. JSPSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 152–85.
- Wise, Michael O. (2000). "New Jerusalem Texts." *DNTB* 742–45.
- Wold, Benjamin G. (2005). *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar LeMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. WUNT 2, 201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wold, Benjamin G. (2008). "Family ethics in 4QInstruction and the New Testament." *NovT* 50: 286–300.

- Wolff, Hans Walter (1988). *Haggai: A Commentary*. CCS. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. (1994). "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan." *JQR* 85: 185–202.
- Wolfson, Harry Austin (1968). *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. 4th printing, revised. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Woolcombe, K. J. (1957). "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology." In *Essays on Typology*. London: SCM: 39–75.
- Worrell, John (1970). "עצה: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?" *VT* 20: 65–74.
- Wray, J. H. (1998). *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth*. SBLDS 166. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wright, Addison G. (1967). "The Structure of the Book of Wisdom." *Bib* 48: 165–84.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (1989). *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent*. SBLSCS 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (1997). "Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood." In *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. BZAW 255. Berlin: De Gruyter: 189–222.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (2007a). "1 Enoch and Ben Sira: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Relationship." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill: 159–76.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (2010). "Ben Sira, Book of." *DEJ* 436–38.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (2008). "The Letter of Aristeas and the Reception History of the Septuagint." In *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*. JSJSup 131. Leiden: Brill: 275–95.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (2011). "The Letter of Aristeas and the Question of Septuagint Origins Redux." *Journal of Ancient Judaism*, 2: 303–25.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (2015). *The Letter of Aristeas: "Aristeas to Philocrates" or "On the Translation of the Law of the Jews"*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wright, J. Edward (1998). "Baruch: His Evolution from Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International: 264–89.
- Wright, J. Edward (2000a). "Baruch, Books of." *DNTB* 148–51.
- Wright, J. Edward (2000b). *The Early History of Heaven*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, N. T. (1991). *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Wright, N. T. (1992). *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N. T. (2003). *Hebrews for Everyone*. London: SPCK.
- Wright, N. T. (2007b). *Surprised by Hope*. London: SPCK.

- Yadin, Yigael (1959). "A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii (4QFlorilegium)." *IEJ* 9: 95–98.
- Yadin, Yigael (1962). *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Yadin, Yigael (1965). "The Excavation of Masada-1963/64 Preliminary Report." *IEJ* 15 (1–2): 1–120.
- Yadin, Yigael (1967). "The Temple Scroll." *BA* 30: 135–39.
- Yadin, Yigael (1977–1983). *The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Yonge, C. D. (1993). *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. New updated ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Young, Norman H. (1973). "TOYT' EETIN THΣ ΣΑΡΚΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ (Heb. x.20): Apposition, Dependent or Explicative." *NTS* 20: 100–04.
- Young, Norman H. (1981). "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9." *NTS* 27: 198–210.
- Young, Norman H. (2001). "'Where Jesus has Gone as a Forerunner on our behalf' (Hebrews 6:20)." *AUSS* 39: 165–73.
- Young, Norman H. (2002a). "'Bearing His Reproach' (Heb 13.9–14)." *NTS* 48: 243–61.
- Young, Norman H. (2002b). "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited." *AUSS* 40: 61–68.
- Young, Norman H. (2003). "Suffering: A Key to the Epistle to the Hebrews." *ABR* 51: 47–59.
- Zahn, Molly (2007). "New Voices, Ancient Words: The *Temple Scroll's* Reuse of the Bible." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 435–58.
- Zeitlin, Solomon (1947). "The Assumption of Moses and the Revolt of Bar Kokba: Studies in the Apocalyptic Literature." *JQR* 38: 1–45.
- Zerwick, Maximilian and Mary Grosvenor (1979). *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Ziegler, Joseph (1980). *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum XII, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zimmer, Robert G. (1975). "The Temple of God." *JETS* 18: 41–46.
- Zsengellér, József (2008). "Does Wisdom Come from the Temple? Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple of Jerusalem." In *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup 127. Leiden: Brill: 135–49.
- Zuntz, G. (1953). *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1946. London: Oxford University Press.

Index of Subjects

- 4QBerakhhot 117–21, 349n174
4QDaily Prayers 121–23, 349n174
4QInstruction 97, 108–10, 349n174
- Aaron 36, 37, 37n42, 58n159, 100, 100n107,
109n162, 271, 307–8, 377n32, 388n91
Priestly order of 38n45, 377n32, 388n91
Abel 338, 339n127, 350, 351n184
Abraham 2n6, 8n28, 18, 61, 109n162, 162, 180,
210, 218, 225–32, 226n163, 228n171,
228n172, 229n173, 230n180, 261n324,
274–75, 280n26, 300, 308n156, 316n25,
333n102, 338, 338n126, 339–43, 339n127,
339n129, 341n137, 341n138, 342n143,
347–48, 364n255, 367n267, 372, 375,
375n27, 376n30, 388
Apocalypse of 225–32, 251n283, 264, 266,
371n11
Ascension of, see Ascension
Access to God, see God
Adam 71n214, 72, 73–74n231, 175n164,
175n165, 175n166, 210, 210n68, 217n109,
218, 222, 222n137, 232, 240n229, 255
as image of God 298–99, 298n108
ascension of see Ascension
creation of 298n108
glory of, see Glory
inheritance of, see Inheritance
priesthood of 37–38, 38n45, 42–43, 86,
86n34, 86n39, 94n78, 175–76
Age
end of 215n97, 226
messianic 205n36, 212n85, 217
present 230, 238n219, 413n203, 415,
415n209, 429n264
to come 230, 249, 291n79, 291n84, 338,
415, 415n208, 415n209, 416n210, 417,
429n264
Akhuzaan 29, 72, 72n222, 72n224, 73n229,
74
Alexandria 45–46, 49, 49n108, 54, 55,
56n148, 71, 72n220
Allusion, see Intertextuality
Altar 228, 233n191, 236, 360–62, 360n229,
360n232, 361n239, 380, 380n49
of burnt offering 50, 141n343, 380n50
of incense 141n343
Christian 359–61
Ancient Near Eastern creation myths 6n19,
330n90, 331n93
Angel of the presence 74n235, 111n168,
113–14, 114n187, 115n193, 171n143, 187–88,
186n213, 187n222, 188n223
Angelomorphism 54n140, 80, 81n9, 114–15,
115n193, 115n194, 116n197, 125–26,
126n255, 131–32n284, 133, 134–35n304
Angels 2–3, 60, 74n236, 75–77, 76n246,
76n248, 105, 105n140, 106, 107–8,
107n151, 111n168, 111–12, 114, 115n193,
117–18, 118n211, 121, 123n233, 124–26,
131n281, 131–32n284, 134–35, 134n297,
134n298, 139, 140n338, 142, 150n33, 155,
166–67, 169–70, 170n140, 172, 174,
189n231, 216, 230, 233n194, 239–40,
252n292, 274–77, 277n113, 283–91,
287n61, 292n86, 295, 297, 297n107,
298–300, 298n110, 299n114, 301–3,
302–3n128, 312n7, 345n152, 348–50,
348n172, 374, 376n30
as heavenly guides 75, 95, 96n89, 156–57,
166, 167, 183, 184–91, 184n208, 187n221,
190n235, 214, 220–224, 227
as God's heavenly host/entourage
147n16, 148–49, 216, 253n298
as holy 107n148, 120–21, 123n234, 124–25,
124n244, 125n248, 131–32, 131n284,
165n123, 186–87, 186n213, 186n215,
294
as mediators 219n116, 223–25, 295n100
as ministering spirits 295, 399n144
as priests 54–55, 58n159, 78, 80–81, 81n9,
110, 114, 115n194, 117, 118n210, 122n231,
128n268, 129–30, 131–33, 131n283,
133n293, 134–35, 134n297, 134n298,
134n299, 134n300, 135–36, 136n312, 139,
140–42, 154–55, 154n147, 154–55n152, 166,
169–70, 172, 187–89, 229n173, 349
Communion/union with 80n4, 81n10,
84, 84–85n27, 102–4, 102n119, 104n131,
105n138, 107n148, 107n152, 108, 109,

- 110–43, 111, 111n68, 112–13, 112n177,
 113n178, 116–23, 122n228, 122n230,
 123–25, 127, 129n268, 130, 132–33,
 132n289, 132–33n290, 133n293, 134–35,
 142, 143, 166–67
 destroying 211, 211n77, 213
 fallen (see also Watchers) 75, 75n238,
 76n245, 146
 of the Lord 186n214
 worship of/heavenly liturgy 4, 32,
 52n126, 75–77, 80–81, 80n4, 104n131,
 112–13, 115n193, 117–18, 118n206, 119–22,
 122n231, 124–25, 127, 128, 128n267,
 129n268, 130, 131–33, 132n290, 133n293,
 134–35, 142, 143, 174n160, 189, 189n233,
 222–23, 222–23n140, 227n168, 229–30,
 229n173, 229n174, 286–90, 287n61,
 292n85, 292n86, 335, 345n152, 347–50,
 349n174, 349n175
 Animal Apocalypse 145, 158–61, 161, 162n102,
 179, 180n187, 405
 Apocalypse of Weeks 145, 161–64, 405
 Apocalyptic 117n203, 185n211, 204n28,
 209n63, 319, 355, 415n209
 Apocalyptic Literature 27, 55, 60, 130, 381n55
Aqedah 228, 339, 367n267, 388
 Aramaic Levi Document 127n264,
 177–78n179, 180n186, 184n207, 190n237,
 191
 Archangels 76, 134, 148, 149, 166–67, 169–70,
 169n136, 170n140
 Aristeas 27, 44–47, 45n86, 46n89, 46n92, 49,
 49n106, 77
 Ascension
 of Abraham 227–232, 227n168
 of Jesus 283n42, 290, 291n84, 308n154,
 371–72, 371n6, 371n8, 374, 374n20,
 377–78
 of Moses 158, 158n75
 Astronomical Book 145n5
 Atonement 98–99, 100–101, 100n107, 101n113,
 116n196, 131, 140, 188–89, 188n223, 225,
 379n44
 Day of, see Day of Atonement

 Babel, Tower of 222, 222n135, 222n137
 Balaam 221n11, 35, 234n195, 247–48, 403–4,
 404n165, 408n183, 411

 Baruch 207n50, 208n51, 208n52, 208n53,
 209, 209n64, 210, 210n72, 211, 211n74,
 211n75, 211n77, 211n78, 212n83, 213,
 213n87, 214, 214n94, 216, 218, 218n110,
 220, 220n123, 221–225, 223n142,
 228n172
 Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of (3 Baruch)
 218–25, 264, 266, 371n11
 Syriac Apocalypse of (2 Baruch) 207–18,
 264, 266
 Benjamin, Testament of 181–82
 Belial/Beliar 87, 106n142, 117, 226n163, 245
 Bethel 93–94, 151, 151n37, 173–74, 250,
 252n291
 Blessing on the Luminaries 123, 123n236
 Blood 2, 23, 48n101, 51, 141n343, 141n347, 142,
 148, 156, 156n60, 188, 188n227, 188n228,
 243, 315n19, 350–51, 351n184, 361,
 361n240, 418n217, 419–21
 application of 416, 416n212
 of Abel 350, 351n184
 of bull(s) 412, 417–18, 428–29
 of the covenant 383n67
 of Jesus 156n60, 315n19, 350, 351n184,
 385–87, 385n77, 412, 416n212, 417–21,
 418n215, 420n224, 420–21n226, 434
 of goat(s) 412, 417–18, 428–29
 pouring out of 422n229
 presentation of 156n60, 416n212, 423
 sacrifice/offering 51, 101n115, 434
 sprinkling of 386–87, 386n82, 416,
 416n211, 416n212, 422, 434
 Body
 of Jesus 416n212, 420n224
 Branch, See David, Sprout of
 Bull(s)
 blood of see Blood

 Call narrative, prophetic 152, 152n40, 191,
 191n239
 Camp 104n131, 105n138, 112n174, 359n228
 outside the camp 4, 359–60, 362–64,
 363n248, 423
 Canaan 2n6, 8, 8n31, 8n36, 9n37, 216,
 294n96, 328n76, 337n120, 339n127,
 339n130, 340n133, 355n205
 Cherubim, Seraphim, Ophanim 155,
 169–70, 240n230, 378

- City, see also Jerusalem 16, 34, 34n23, 37, 49, 49n107, 50, 56, 65, 66, 88, 91n59, 179, 195n263, 196, 200n7, 202, 202n16, 203, 204n26, 206, 206n44, 209–11, 210n66, 211–13, 211n77, 218, 257, 262, 323n58, 340n133, 341n135, 356n211, 360, 362n247, 364n254, 365, 365n259
- heavenly/enduring/eternal /to come 4, 5, 7, 8n28, 10n42, 50, 95–97, 96n91, 142, 154, 157, 160, 160n86, 192, 201, 203–4, 206, 206n43, 207, 207n46, 209–11, 215–16, 291n79, 315n21, 327n75, 333n102, 333n106, 336, 336n117, 339n129, 340–41, 340n133, 341n135, 342–43, 347–48, 347n164, 356, 357n220, 358n222, 360, 365, 365n258, 365n259, 391n112, 403n163, 409n189, 410, 410n191, 433
- Cloud/s 41–42, 77n241
- pillar of 33
- over the tabernacle/temple 258, 260
- Community Rule 97–103, 97–98n94, 349n174
- Copy 56–59, 59n163, 67–68, 68n200, 68n201, 78, 197–98, 207, 210n72, 229n177, 235, 257, 259, 406–8, 406–7n173, 408n183, 408n185, 409n188, 412, 414n206, 424n238, 424n240, 425, 427, 427n253, 427n254, 429n261, 429n266, 431n275, 431, 433–34
- copy and shadow 1–2, 1n2, 1n4, 5n15, 23, 27, 70, 88, 130n276, 272n18, 372n12, 404–12, 409n187, 424n238, 428, 428–29n261, 429–30, 430n269, 434
- Cosmology 432
- Cosmos as a temple, see Universe
- Covenant 107n150, 115, 116–17, 123, 195n262, 208n51, 235n205, 346, 392n114, 400, 411, 421n228, 423–24
- Ark of the 160n94, 170, 194n258, 239–40, 240n230, 321n40, 324n59, 325n64, 367n267, 379, 379n44, 402n158
- new/better 17, 346–47, 347n162, 349, 350–52, 367n268, 387, 390n104, 395, 410, 411, 414, 421, 425, 427n257, 430
- old /former/Sinai 17, 346–47, 350–52, 356n211, 364n255, 383n67, 387n86, 410, 410n95, 411, 413n203, 414, 422, 427n25, 428, 429n261, 432
- renewal of 117n202, 121, 121n224, 421, 423–24
- Creation 117, 172, 205n32, 296n101, 317, 335, 336, 340n131, 354, 356–58, 356n212
- of the cosmos 74, 78, 158, 214, 238n221, 328–29, 328n79, 330–31
- destruction/reversal of 210–11, 211n75, 218, 356n211
- renewal of 92n63, 93n72, 172n151, 173, 173n157, 174n161, 214, 217, 218, 300
- shaking of 4, 214, 245, 352–58, 353n197, 356n209, 357n214, 357n219, 365n257, 373
- as a temple 3, 6–7, 42–43
- Christ, see Jesus
- Christology
- high-priestly 369
- of Hebrews 115n194
- Citation, see Intertextuality
- Community Rule 97–103, 97–98n94, 98n98, 349n174
- Cosmic disturbance, see also Creation, shaking of 146n12, 168, 168n131, 168n133, 352–54, 356–57
- Cross 360–61, 361n242, 385n77, 416n212
- Crown
- with glory 3, 42, 42n70, 298, 301–3, 305–6, 433
- Curtain, see Temple, veil of, and Tabernacle, veil/hangings of
- Dan 146, 150–52, 151n35
- Testament of Dan 181, 182
- David 83, 83n21, 89n49, 159, 194n257, 204, 207, 216–17, 217n107, 233n194, 257, 285, 287, 313, 316n21, 318, 323n58, 332, 332n99, 339n127, 340n132, 367n267, 376, 379, 405n170
- house/ household of 83–84, 87, 162n104, 285, 313–14, 316n21
- Sprout of 83, 83n20, 87, 397–98, 397n136
- Day of Atonement 38, 38–39n48, 41–42, 67, 155–56, 188n224, 224–25, 225n150, 225n154, 282n40, 362, 362n247, 371, 375, 379–80, 385n77, 392n115, 396–97n133, 402–3, 412–13, 416n211, 417–21, 423–24, 434
- Day of judgement 157, 172
- Death
- of Jesus 4, 199n2, 283, 283n42, 284–85n52, 296–97, 297n105, 305n137, 308–9, 308n154, 309n160, 310n162,

- 361n242, 363, 364n255, 385–86, 385n77,
386n80, 387, 411, 416, 416n211, 416n212,
418, 421, 422n228, 435
- Debir*, see Holy of Holies
- Diaspora 16n79, 64, 65, 66n195, 72n224,
78n254, 181n191, 192
- Dualism
- cosmic 1–2
 - earth/heaven 70, 105–6, 105n140,
105–6n142, 107n151, 107–8, 115n193,
126n256, 172, 172n149, 172n150, 174n160,
229n177, 370, 380
 - human/divine 115n193
 - light/darkness 104
 - material/spiritual 328n76
 - spatial (above/below) 9–10, 115–16,
116n197, 346, 347n162, 382n60, 388,
409n188, 414, 415n207, 427, 426n252,
429n264, 430–31, 435, 435n3
 - temporal (present/future) 9–10, 115–16,
115n195, 116n197, 346, 347n162, 388,
409n188, 414, 415n207, 416, 429n264,
430–31, 435, 435n3
- Dwelling of God, see God
- Earth 204n32, 216, 217n110, 221, 234n198, 240,
272, 285–86, 290–91, 331, 352–58,
352n194, 353n196, 353n197, 356n211, 372,
372n12, 394n125, 403n163
- Echo, see Intertextuality
- Eden 35n27, 73, 75, 86n34, 86n38, 86n39, 93,
156n66, 157, 172–74, 176n169, 181, 182,
197, 204–5n32, 217, 218, 226, 227,
230n181, 230–31, 239–41, 240n229,
330n90, 376n30, 404n165
- as a temple/sanctuary 7, 27, 35–36, 43,
75, 79n2, 86, 93, 94n78, 110n165,
112n174, 157, 172, 172n148, 175–76, 181,
210n68, 237, 239n225, 330n90, 376n30,
404n165
- Egypt 29, 44n81, 46, 49n108, 55n141, 60–61,
61n174, 71, 71n217, 72n220, 78, 158,
196n266, 238n217, 242n239, 244, 246,
247n263, 253, 253n296, 266, 304n133,
305, 317
- Eleazar 49, 53–54, 363n248, 377n32
- Eli 170n139, 313–14, 376
- Enoch 36, 36n37, 36n38, 70–77, 70–71n214,
72n221, 73–74n231, 112n174, 146, 146n8,
149–50, 152–57, 153n44, 155n53, 161, 165,
167–68, 169–70, 169n136, 170n140,
171n146, 172, 172n149, 178n179, 178n180,
179–80, 180n187, 181, 181n191, 182, 183,
277n13, 338, 339n127, 354n204, 371n11,
376n30
- Dream Visions of 145, 145n5, 171n145, 172
- Epistle of 145n5, 161, 161n99
- heavenly journey of 72, 73–77,
74–75n237, 78, 81, 145, 149–56, 150n31,
151n37, 153n44, 153n46, 166, 167–68,
169–70, 227n168
- Parables of, see Parables, book of the
- priesthood of, see Priesthood
- Proto-Epistle of Enoch 145n5
- transformation into an angel 73–74n231,
74n235, 74–75n237, 76n244, 169–70
- Eschatological battle 97n91, 104–5, 105n138,
105n140, 105–6n142, 107n151, 107–8, 112,
162n102, 212n85, 217
- Eschatology 2, 7, 74, 78, 86n38, 87, 102n119,
114–16, 115n195, 122n230, 126, 181n191,
182, 203–5, 217–18n110, 250, 273, 333,
338n122, 341–43, 346n155, 348n168,
365n258, 368, 372n12, 395, 404n165, 410
- Eschaton 111, 7, 9, 10, 20, 23, 27, 58, 59, 74,
97, 103n122, 104n131, 115, 115n195,
122n230, 126, 143, 157, 158, 158n74, 161,
162, 166, 182, 193, 205n32, 207, 225, 241,
250, 266, 274, 278, 285, 287n61, 299n114,
310, 329, 335n13, 340–41, 378, 390n104,
391n112, 401, 410, 415, 416n211, 432,
434–35, 435n3
- Eucharist 188–89n228, 360–61, 360n232,
360n237, 361n241, 362n243, 365
- Exaltation
- of humanity, see Humans/people,
 - exaltation to heaven 111–13,
111–12n171, 115
 - of Jesus/Christ 2–3, 4–5, 87, 111n168, 115,
140, 143, 164n112, 241, 250, 266, 272–73,
274–85, 276n5, 276n8, 292n85, 293n90,
294, 299–303, 299n114, 303n128, 304,
305n137, 309–10, 309n159, 309–10n160,
310n162, 311, 333, 335, 338, 371n8, 373n17,
377–78, 391, 392–94, 393n119, 393n120,
394n124, 397–98, 397n135, 400, 405, 410,
411, 415, 417n214, 425, 431, 431n274, 432,
433–35, 435n3

- Exile 30, 46, 47, 61–62, 159, 159n85, 162, 168, 172, 176, 181, 183, 207–8, 209, 253n296
- Exodus 158, 171n142, 215, 253n296 259, 287, 294–95, 304, 316, 316n25, 323, 338
- Ezekiel 152–53, 153n44, 229–30
- Ezekiel the Tragedian 287n61
- Ezra 199n1, 200–207, 206n43, 207n46, 228n172
- Fourth Book of 199–208, 200–201n2, 200n4, 202n13, 202n15, 208n58, 264, 266
- Faith 73n228, 336–38, 338n124, 342
- Faithfulness 312n7, 313–14, 313n10
- Firstborn 109–10, 109n163, 277, 281, 284n50, 288–90, 288n66, 289n69, 316n25, 348–50, 348n172, 372
- Flesh
- human 43, 93, 109, 122n230, 249n278,
 - of Christ 383–86, 385n75, 385n77, 418n217
- Foreshadowing, symbolic 1–2, 4, 5n15, 17, 58, 401, 404–11, 409n187, 409n188, 412, 414–15n206, 415–16, 421, 422–24, 424n240, 427–28, 430–31, 429n261, 432, 433
- Goal, eschatological of God's people 3, 5, 9–10, 165–67, 294–95, 310, 311, 314–16, 315n17, 351–52, 368, 390, 391n112
- Glory 301–3, 304, 303n129, 304n136, 310, 311, 312n7, 315, 315n21, 316n25, 336, 353–54, 353n198, 433
- of Adam 36–38, 36n38, 37–38n44, 42–43, 74n231
 - of God 58, 58n159
- Gnosticism 289n69, 304n137, 318–19, 318n28, 318n29, 319n30, 334n108, 371n9, 384n69, 391n111
- Goat(s)
- blood of, see Blood
- God
- access to 10, 10n42, 12, 23, 113n178, 142–44, 187n222, 199, 225n154, 231, 241, 310, 311, 345n152, 345n154, 348, 352, 356n211, 358, 368, 369–88, 381n55, 381n56, 381n57, 385n77, 386n80, 387, 403, 412, 415–16, 415n207, 419, 421n226, 433
 - approach to 4, 75n228, 144, 154–56, 155n57, 155n58, 172, 225n154, 306, 310, 336, 344, 344–45n152, 363, 369–71, 378–81, 380n49, 380–81n53, 381n55, 382n59, 383, 385n77, 387, 390n104
 - dwelling of 106, 106n145, 113, 113n184, 114, 142, 146–49, 147n13, 147n16, 154, 157, 170, 187n219, 190, 234, 238, 256–57, 261, 281, 304n133, 372–73, 373n16, 382, 382n59, 393–94, 394n124, 412, 426, 433
 - eschatological dwelling with people 1–2, 1n1, 4, 5, 9, 57–58, 70, 78, 81, 83–84, 88, 93–94, 94n77, 144, 157, 173, 174n161, 197–98, 199, 205, 266, 273, 310, 311, 340–41, 340n131, 340n132, 342–43, 347–48, 348n171, 358, 361, 368, 369, 391, 400–411, 403n163, 404n165, 416n211, 420–21, 426, 431, 433, 435
 - glory of, see Glory
 - kingdom of 126, 135–36, 140, 173, 182, 190–91, 223, 280n29, 293, 293n90, 333n106, 354–55, 357, 357n214, 374, 382n63
- Heaven(s) 111n169, 111–12n171, 112n174, 146–47, 147n14, 167–68, 169n136, 169n137, 172, 184–91, 185n213, 204n32, 217n110, 221n129, 222n139, 229, 233, 234n198, 237–38, 238n221, 257, 277n13, 290, 315n17, 318n29, 319n32, 331, 331n94, 339n129, 350, 352–58, 352n192, 353n197, 356n211, 370–73, 371n7, 372n11, 372n12, 372n13, 373n16, 373n17, 374n20, 376n30, 377n32, 378, 382, 392–94, 393n117, 393n120, 393n121, 394n124, 394n125, 397–98, 398n140, 410n193, 412, 420–21n226, 422–23, 424n238, 425, 425n243
- as a temple, see Temple, in heaven/ heavenly/celestial
 - as God's dwelling place, see God, dwelling of
- gates of 151, 152n39, 183, 189, 190n235, 190n236, 190n237, 223
- heavenly council 31, 32n16,
- heavenly country/homeland 315n17, 327n75, 333n102, 342–43, 342n139, 348, 391n112, 409n189, 410

- levels of 72, 74n235, 75, 76n249, 77, 77n251, 78, 184–91, 184n208, 187n221, 190n237, 197, 221–25, 221n129, 222n138, 223n142, 224n147, 229–30, 229n175, 292n85, 371–72, 371n9, 372n11, 373n16, 378, 392–93, 394n124
- new heaven and earth 7, 93–94, 93n72, 94n74, 167–68, 356n209
- on earth 107n151, 112n177, 113n178
- priests in 52–53
- shaking of 215, 352–58, 352n197, 356n209, 357n214, 357n219, 365n257, 372
- temple in, see Temple, in heaven/
heavenly/celestial
- Heavenly beings, see Angels
- Heavenly journey/ascent 102, 110–11, 121, 129–30, 129–30n272, 144, 151n37, 185n211, 189n234, 226, 227n168, 349, 369–72, 380, 381n55, 382
- Heavenly things 2, 273, 315n17, 340n31, 357, 394, 400, 404–11, 407n173, 412, 415–16, 422–28, 424n239, 424n242, 431
- Hekhalot literature 154n48, 183n32, 227n168, 229n174, 229n178
- Heron, Mount 75n243, 146, 146n10, 150–52, 150n34, 151n35, 151n37, 157
- Herod the Great 164, 164n113, 192, 192n247, 193n250, 193n254, 255, 260–61, 261n325, 262, 262n328
- High priest 58, 113–14, 155–56, 173n156, 187n222, 238n221, 239n225, 262, 263n330, 264, 269–70, 269n2, 269n3, 272, 297, 345n152, 371, 375, 380, 383, 392n115, 396–97n133, 397–98, 398n137, 412–13, 416, 418–21, 418n215, 434
- clothing of 37n44, 38n45, 39n48, 42–43, 44, 49, 53–54, 58, 113n185, 114n189, 136n315, 261, 264
- Hodayot 111–13, 124n240, 349n174
- Holiness 99n102, 100–101n109, 102n117, 114, 118, 118n210, 119, 123, 129, 132, 190, 218
- degrees of 77, 77n253, 78, 154–55, 183, 187, 189, 197, 224, 246, 264, 322–23
- Holy of holies/*Debir*/ Most Holy Place 100, 100n107, 109–10, 109n162, 110n165, 114, 118n210, 123, 170, 170n138, 175, 176n170, 187n219, 255, 258, 261, 319n31, 412–13, 416n212
- earthly 39n48, 67, 69n210, 118, 137n316, 173, 187, 197, 211, 211n78, 213, 255, 331, 345n152, 371, 378, 380, 380n49, 383, 383n68, 386, 387, 401–2, 403n162, 403n163, 413–15, 413n198, 416n211, 416–17n212, 418, 423, 423n231, 423n235, 434
- in heaven/heavenly 118, 123, 123n234, 129n269, 130, 136–37, 136n312, 137n317, 137n321, 139–40, 154–56, 154n51, 156n60, 183, 187, 223–25, 273, 283n42, 309n159, 315n19, 319, 336n117, 345n152, 372n11, 380, 380n52, 382, 384–86, 388–91, 391n109, 391n112, 400n150, 402–4, 412, 416n211, 419–21, 420–21n226, 423, 423n235, 425n245
- Holy place(s) 114n190, 216n104, 266n348, 425n245
- Hope 62, 64n187, 97, 103, 207, 209n63, 202n83, 213, 217–18n110, 220, 221n128, 225, 235n205, 246, 253, 280n29, 303n131, 310, 311, 327n76, 337–38, 339n128, 387, 388–91, 389n95, 389n98, 390n102, 390n103, 390n104, 391n112, 430n267
- Horeb, see Sinai
- House 240n227, 312n6, 315n19, 315n21, 316n22, 325n63, 341n137, 353–54, 376–77
- of God 105n138, 154–55, 155n153, 157, 170n138, 213, 213n88, 216n104, 235–36, 239, 243, 243n245, 256, 258, 311–12, 312n7, 313–16, 315n16, 321, 331, 376, 382n60, 399n147
- household 240n227, 311–16, 316n22, 341n137
- Humans/people 158, 296n101, 298–99, 302–3n128, 304n136
- as blood and flesh 418n217
- exaltation to heaven 107n148, 111–13, 111n168, 111–12n171, 115, 120n219, 134–35, 134n297, 134–35n304, 135–36, 139–40, 139n328, 140n338
- ruling the world to come 3, 275, 295–311, 296n101, 298n109, 300n119, 315n17, 332, 336, 338, 356n212, 357, 433, 433n1
- sanctified/made holy 125n247, 125n248, 165n123, 302, 311–12, 428–30
- transformed into/identified with angels 125–26, 125n250, 126n255,

Humans/people (cont.)

126n256, 131–32n284, 133n293, 133n294,
134–35, 134n297, 134n299, 135–36,
229n173, 312n7

Image

of God 295–99, 301–3

Imitation, see Copy

Inheritance 110n164, 321, 400

Intertextuality 20–22

allusion 22, 275–76, 285, 290n75, 299,
299n113
citation formula 21–22, 286–95, 296
echo 22, 281, 294
quotation 21–22, 275–77, 285–95,
285n53, 296–303

Isaac 180, 338n126, 339, 339n127, 347n160,
351n184

sacrifice of, see *Aqedah*

Isaiah 152–53, 153n44, 331n94

Israel 176, 181, 205n32, 209, 234, 234n195,
234n198, 235n205, 239n222, 240n227,
251, 280n29, 341n138, 347n161, 354,
364n255, 401n152

land of, see Land

new/renewed/restored 100–101, 109–10,
141n347, 160

people of 98–99, 100–101, 100n107,
101n113, 103, 104, 104n129, 105n140,
110n166, 122, 162, 193n250, 196, 203,
364n255, 376n30

Jacob 93–94, 151, 151n37, 173–74, 176, 180,
183, 183n205, 186n213, 190n236, 250–53,
250n282, 251n287, 252n292, 338n126,
339, 339n127, 347n160, 351n184,
408n183

Ladder of 114n192, 250–53, 266

Jeremiah 350–52, 394–95, 428

Jerusalem 4, 16, 34, 34n23, 37, 38, 39–41, 45,
46, 49, 49n107, 50, 50n112, 50n114, 56,
64, 65–67, 65n193, 68, 72, 72n222,
72n224, 73–74, 77, 78, 95–97, 95n82, 108,
141n347, 146, 146n11, 157, 157n69, 159–60,
159n79, 160n89, 163, 164, 173–74,
173n153, 179, 192, 194n257, 194n258,
194n259, 195–96, 195n262, 195n263,
196n264, 197, 202, 202n115, 206n45, 208,

211, 210n66, 210n72, 214–16, 220–21,
228n172, 235, 236n206, 236n211,
236n212, 237n216, 238n221, 240, 242–43,
248n273, 249n280, 251–52, 252n291,
254, 255n303, 257–58, 261n324, 262,
262n327, 263n334, 263n335, 271n12,
272–73, 310, 327n75, 333n102, 340n133,
347–48, 347n164, 348n168, 362,
362n247, 364n254, 365–66, 365n258,
367n267, 368, 433

eschatological pilgrimage to 63–64, 160

fall of 180, 199, 202, 219n116, 220–21,
220n119, 220n123, 242, 242n244, 244–47,
254, 356n212, 365n257

Heavenly/new/celestial 4, 5, 7, 88,
95–97, 95n82, 100n106, 115n195, 157, 160,
160n86, 160n94, 167n125, 181n191, 182,
197, 203–6, 204n23, 205n36, 206n45,
210n72, 211, 212n85, 214n92, 238n221,
248–49, 250, 310, 315n17, 333–35,
333n102, 336, 341, 340n134, 341n135,
342–43, 347–52, 347n164, 348n171, 355,
358n222, 365, 381n53, 410, 433, 435

temple, see Temple

Jesus/Christ 165, 179–80, 179n181, 179n182,
182, 185n212, 190n236, 191n239, 208n51,
219n116, 222n136, 242n242, 296n101,
296, 298n109, 299–303, 301n122,
302–3n128, 311–12, 312n7, 314n13, 315n21,
317, 333n103, 335n13, 338, 338n123, 343,
343n145, 346, 350, 351, 359, 360–61, 363,
365–66, 365n259, 368, 369–71, 371n6,
372n12, 373, 373n16, 373n17, 380,
380n53, 389n95, 391–92, 391n112,
393n119, 412, 416–21, 416n212, 424, 435

as forerunner 289n69, 381n55, 387, 389,
390, 390n108, 391n112

as high priest 3–4, 115n194, 275, 297,
308n154, 309n159, 311–12, 311n1, 315n19,
345n152, 361, 369–71, 370n3, 374n20,
377–79, 377n32, 377n34, 380n52, 381,
388, 391–92, 395–97, 396–97n133, 399,
411, 417–21, 417n214, 421, 425, 428

as human being 298, 302–3, 309

as mediator 350–51, 410

as (self)-offering 309n160, 361, 392, 395,
396–97n133, 402–3, 411, 416–21,
416–17n212, 418n215, 425, 428–31

- as pioneer 3, 5, 289n69, 295, 299–300, 304–5, 303n129, 303n130, 304–5n137, 305n140, 309n158, 310, 335, 343, 390n108
 as priest 3–4, 135n310, 191, 283, 309n159, 309–10n160, 311–12, 370, 378n35, 382n60, 391, 394, 394n127, 396–97, 396–97n133
 ascension of, see Ascension
 blood of, see Blood
 body of 418n215
 crucifixion of 248n270
 death of, see Death
 exaltation of, see Exaltation
 heavenly ministry of 4, 136n313, 369–81, 378n35, 394–95, 394n127, 398–99, 399n145, 403, 410, 411, 423, 426, 427n257
 heavenly session 275–85, 276n9, 338, 370–71, 372, 426, 428
 incarnation of 288, 290–92, 292n86, 380n53, 385, 385n77, 417n214
 kingdom of 291n79, 291n84, 293n90, 433
 offering/sacrifice of 4, 283, 306, 309n159, 361n242, 369, 385n77, 422
 perfection of, see Perfection
 priestly qualifications of 309–10
 resurrection of, see Resurrection
 second coming/return of (see also Parousia) 212n86, 292n85, 393n119
 superiority of 5, 283–85, 289–92, 292n86, 295
 tribal lineage of 18
 Joseph 176, 287n61, 338, 339n127
 Josephus 28, 46, 58, 254–65, 254n299, 255n304, 256n307, 256–57n310, 258n318, 261n324, 261n325, 262n327, 262n328, 263n330, 264n337, 264n339, 266, 331, 340n134, 342n139, 374n20
 Joshua (son of Nun) 159, 193, 195n262, 233n191, 236, 239, 301n122, 318, 323, 326n72, 332–33, 333n102, 333n103, 333n104, 339n127, 340n131, 375
 Joshua (post-exilic high priest) 159n81, 377, 377n32, 397, 397n135
 Jubilees 86, 86n35, 127n264, 171–76, 177, 178n179, 181, 191n241
 Judah 108, 176n170, 183, 185n213
 Testament of 183
 Judaism 17–18, 44–46, 61, 61n174, 65–67, 66n196, 182, 364, 364n254, 364n255, 365, 378, 415n209, 435
 Judgement
 eternal/eschatological 400
 Kenaz 239–41
 King, Davidic 164n112, 274–75, 280–81, 280n29, 281, 284–85, 398n138
 Kittim 105n137
 Land 49, 159, 204n26, 204n27, 212n85, 237n216, 238n217, 322–23, 327n75, 340n131, 340n133, 364n255
 of Israel 95n82, 100–101, 101n113, 173, 193n250, 203–4, 339–40
 of promise 94, 94n78, 216, 287, 294–95, 304, 304n133, 310, 318, 321, 327, 327n75, 328n78, 333n102, 336, 339–40, 340n131
 Last days, the 82, 83n20, 84, 85n31, 86, 86n38, 87, 87n43, 88, 103–4, 103n122, 104n129, 104n131, 143, 274, 277–79, 278n16, 281, 293, 296n104, 310, 311, 315n21, 369, 377–78, 398, 400, 411, 420, 423n232, 431, 434
 Law of Moses 35n26, 44, 44n81, 49, 49n108, 61, 62, 162, 163n107, 185n209, 208n51, 236, 295n100, 305–6, 338, 344, 392, 426n250, 428–31, 428n261, 430n269
 Levi 81n9, 115n193, 150n34, 176, 178n179, 180, 181, 182–91, 185n210, 185–86n213, 187n222, 270, 375, 392n115, 394n124
 heavenly journey of 183, 184–91, 227n168, 394n124
 priesthood of 176, 182, 183, 183n203, 183n205, 185–86, 184n208, 185–86n213, 187n222, 191–91, 190n236, 197, 308n152, 375
 Testament of 154, 177–78n179, 179–81, 182–91, 218n111, 371n111
 Levite 270n6, 380n49
 Luminaries, Book of the 145
 Maccabean revolt 158, 161, 162, 162n102, 193, 193n254, 215, 251n283
 Manual of Discipline, see Community Rule
Maskil 102, 102n117, 113–14, 123–24, 124n238, 128n267

- Massah 320, 320n38
 Melchizedek 4, 70–71n214, 72–73, 72n223,
 73n226, 81n9, 135n310, 365n259, 388,
 388n91, 388n92, 391–92, 394
 priestly order of 4, 135n310, 388–89,
 388n91, 388n92, 391–92, 394, 394n127
 Meribah 320, 320n38
 Merkabah 117, 129–30, 129n269, 169n136,
 185n211, 183n32, 381n55
 Messiah 62n180, 64, 114, 115n195, 116n196,
 181, 200n5, 201–2, 205n32, 208n51, 213,
 247–49, 247n263, 248n270, 249n279,
 308n156
 Metatron 169n136, 284n51
 Michael 105n142, 141n347, 170n140, 219n116,
 223–25, 225n154, 287n61
 Midrash 82n13
 Eschatological Midrash^a (4Q174) 81–89,
 82n16, 91
 Eschatological Midrash^b (4Q177) 82,
 82n14, 82n16
 Moses 2, 5, 8, 35n26, 36, 42n63, 48n101,
 48n105, 57, 59n163, 67–69, 68n201, 70,
 78, 96n89, 137, 151, 151n37, 158, 171,
 171n143, 172, 174, 193, 195n262, 208n51,
 210, 215–16, 215n98, 218, 228, 228n171,
 233, 233n194, 235, 235n205, 237–38,
 237–38n217, 238n219, 239, 241, 255n306,
 257, 265n347, 287n61, 289n69, 312–14,
 312n7, 314n13, 316n25, 317, 323n57,
 330–31, 338, 339n127, 344, 346, 346n156,
 363n248, 363n249, 374n23, 404,
 404n164, 405–6, 405n169, 406n172,
 407n176, 408, 410, 410n194, 426,
 426n248, 426n252, 434
 ascension of, see Ascension
 Testament/Assumption of 191–97,
 191n241
 Mountain/s 156–57, 222n139, 353n196
 cosmic 8–9, 156–57, 197
 holy 157
 Mysticism/mystic 117, 117n203, 132n290,
 315n17, 385n77
 Nations
 streaming to Jerusalem 217, 249–50,
 353–54, 353n199
 wealth of 108
 Nero 28, 244–47, 245n254, 246n258,
 248n275, 249n279, 250, 254, 266
 New Jerusalem Scroll 81, 95–97, 95n79,
 96n86, 96n87, 96n88, 96n89, 96n90,
 96n91, 143
 Noah 63n185, 112n174, 158n75, 161, 173, 222,
 222n137, 338, 339n127, 367n267, 376n30
 Offering(s) 216, 223–24, 223n143, 265, 428
 burnt 63, 101, 233n191
 drink 63
 of blood, see Blood
 of Jesus, see Jesus
 peace/fellowship/well-being 140–41,
 365–67, 366n264
 sin 410, 428
 speech (offerings of the lips) 101–2,
 101–2n115, 102n116, 143, 231–32, 360,
 365–67, 366n262
 tamid 38, 38–39n48, 42–43
Omphalos 195, 195n262, 248, 248n273
 Ophannim, see Cherubim
 Palace, of God 8n31, 90n54, 147–48n19,
 152n39, 154
 Palestine 71n217, 78, 163n107, 164n113, 192,
 200, 232, 249n280, 266, 266n348
 Parables, Book of the 145, 145n5, 164–70,
 165n114
 Paradise 73, 74n235, 75, 75n240, 78, 204–5,
 204n27, 204n32, 205n36, 216–17,
 217n110, 222n136, 238n221, 239n225,
 240n229, 241
 Parousia
 Of Jesus 290–92, 291n84
 Passover/Pesach 171n142, 174, 347n161
 Patriarchs 173, 338, 339n129, 341–42, 341n137,
 342n139, 347–48
 Testaments of the Twelve 176–91
 Paul 364n255, 374
 Perfection 303–10, 306n144, 307n146, 343,
 428
 of Jesus 303n129, 303n130, 306–7,
 306n144, 308–10, 308n155, 309n158,
 310n162, 392
 of humans 4, 305–6, 306n144, 308–10,
 350, 428–30
 Pentecost 117n202

- Peshier 82n13, 83
 Philo 2, 55, 56n148, 57n156, 59n163, 64–70,
 77–78, 94n73, 232, 255–56, 256n307,
 256n309, 256n310, 266, 289n69, 318,
 319n33, 331, 340n134, 342n139, 346n156,
 355, 372n12, 374n20, 377n32, 395n130,
 408, 408n183, 427n254, 429–30,
 429–30n266, 432, 434
 Pseudo-Philo 232–41, 233n191, 233n194,
 234n199, 237n213, 239n222, 239n225,
 240n230
 Phinehas 36–37, 37n42, 38n46, 233n191, 269,
 319–20n33, 324n59, 377n32
 Pilgrim 339n129
 Place, sacred, see also Space, sacred 151n37,
 151n38, 173–74, 210, 210n71, 213, 236n206
 Plato 67–68, 67n199, 70, 346n156, 423n231,
 429
 Platonism 142, 294n94, 319n30, 328n76,
 338n122, 346n156, 355n207, 355n208,
 365n258, 400n150, 406n172, 429n264,
 431
 Middle 372n12, 408n183, 429, 429n264,
 432, 434
 Plutarch 334n107, 418n216
 Prayer/s 121–22, 121n225, 122n228, 122n229,
 122n230, 123, 370
 Priest/s 51–54, 95, 96n91, 100n107, 155, 256,
 260, 264–65, 265n346, 270n6, 283, 307,
 309n159, 315n19, 362n243, 363n248,
 366n264, 370, 374, 392, 393n118, 394,
 410, 413
 clothing of 53–54, 136, 255–56
 faithful 112n174, 170n139, 297, 311–13,
 376–78, 377n34
 Priesthood 4, 19, 27, 30, 30n3, 37n42, 38,
 54–55, 64, 67, 72–73, 72n221, 73n226,
 75n243, 86, 96n91, 99, 100, 110n166, 115,
 115n193, 124, 132, 132n285, 144, 146, 159,
 163n109, 172, 176, 178n179, 178–80, 183,
 185n213, 189–91, 190n236, 196–97, 199,
 206, 213, 218n11, 224, 233n191, 263,
 269–71, 270n6, 271n12, 272, 307–10,
 345n152, 354n204, 368, 376, 380–81,
 381n57, 383, 387, 387n85, 404–5, 433
 at Qumran 114, 115n194, 120, 120–21n222,
 121n224, 122, 125–26, 128n268, 130, 132,
 132n285, 133n293
 eschatological 172
 Levitical 17, 72, 185, 188–89, 206, 214,
 270–71, 270n6, 272n18, 306, 362,
 362n243, 375, 397n133, 404–5, 428n261
 of Enoch 72, 146, 150, 155–56, 172, 176,
 176n169
 of Jesus/Christ 272, 272n18, 282n39,
 283n42, 369–70, 377, 404
 of Melchizedek 72–73, 135n310, 270, 388,
 388n91, 388n92
 Zadokite 98–99, 103, 113, 113n182,
 113–14n185
 Promised land, see Land
 Protology 27, 58, 75, 77–78, 86n38, 181, 182,
 230, 404n165
 Purification 282–83, 282n39, 283n42, 285,
 335, 363n248, 387, 425
 Purity
 connection with holiness 103–4
 Qumran 29n1, 79n1, 79n2, 86n35, 98, 111,
 115n193, 121–22, 122n229, 122n230, 123,
 126n255, 127n264, 128–29n268,
 138n323, 142n349, 145, 145n15, 171n145,
 178n179, 218n111, 349, 349n174, 367,
 367n267, 405
 community 79–80, 79n1, 79n2, 79n3,
 80n4, 80n6, 82, 82n18, 83n21, 85n27,
 89n48, 90n53, 92n66, 95n79, 97–99,
 98n99, 99n101, 100, 100n106, 100n107,
 100n109, 101n113, 102, 102n117, 103,
 103n122, 104n131, 105n137, 107n148,
 108n156, 109–10, 110n166, 112n177,
 113, 113n182, 113n183, 115–16, 116n197,
 116n198, 117, 120n220, 120–21,
 120–21n222, 122, 122n229, 122n230, 123,
 124–28, 127–28n264, 128–29n268,
 131–33, 131n284, 135n308, 171, 278–79,
 349
 community council 100, 102, 103n126, 114
 community leaders 117n202
 Quotation, see Intertextuality
 Rahab 337n120, 338–39, 339n127, 363n248
 Red heifer 363n248, 387
 Rest 3, 33–34, 310, 315n21, 316–36, 319n32,
 319n33, 321n39, 321n40, 321n42, 321n42,
 322n46, 322n54, 324–25n63, 333n102,
 335n113, 336n117, 337n120, 344, 345n152,
 348, 352, 380n53, 387, 433–34

Rest (cont.)

- as temple 3, 7, 33–34, 75–77, 272–73, 321n39, 322, 322n53, 322n54, 323n57, 325, 325n67, 331, 331n93, 332n95, 333n106
- eschatological 3, 5, 75–77, 75n242, 204–5, 217, 272, 329, 332, 333n102, 333n103, 333n106, 335, 339n128, 380n53, 390, 390n104, 391n112
- in the promised land 204, 216, 319n32, 321n39, 322, 322n46, 322n53, 322n54, 323n57, 324, 325–27, 328n78, 332, 333n102, 333n103, 333n104, 339n127, 340n131

Resurrection 242n242, 248n275

- eschatological 238
- of Jesus 199n2, 284–85n52, 290n76, 299n114

Restoration, post-exilic 29, 46, 47, 61, 64n187, 94, 94n77, 97, 159n85, 163, 168, 172–74, 174n160, 176, 180, 183, 194n257, 195–96, 253n296, 341n138, 351, 353

Romans (people) 105n137

Rome 60–61, 193n254, 201, 241–42, 243n244, 244–47, 245n254, 245n255, 248n273, 252–53, 252n292, 253n296, 254, 261–64, 263n330, 263n331, 265, 265n345, 266, 290, 364n254

Rule of Benedictions 113–16, 193

Rule of the Congregation 97, 103–4, 349n174

Sabbath 121, 121n225, 127, 128n265, 130n278, 132n290, 171n142, 172, 244n252, 263n334, 318, 319n32, 333–34n107, 334n111, 363n248, 428n261

- as celebration 318, 333–35, 333–34n107, 334n111, 348n172

- as rest 318, 321n40, 324–25, 324n60, 333–35, 333–35n107

Sacrifice (see also Offering) 64–65, 65n193, 72n221, 73n231, 175–76, 195–96, 196n264, 227–29, 228n172, 236, 243n247, 255, 263n329, 366n265, 367n266, 428

- animal 100–101, 101–2n115, 140–42, 188–89n228, 232, 243, 416–21, 420–21n226, 423

- good deeds 232, 365–67

- in heaven 23, 97, 129n268, 140–42, 140n341, 140–41n343, 141n347, 142, 142n350, 143, 155–56, 188–89,

- 188–89n228, 189n229, 189n230, 199, 237–38n217, 361, 434

Jesus as, see Death, of Jesus

metaphorical 141, 141n344, 225, 365–67, 366n262

spiritual/perfect lives (see also Offerings, speech) 100, 101–2, 101–2n115, 102n116, 365–67

Sacrifices (see also Offering) 61, 72, 72n224, 73–74, 77, 86, 86n39, 88, 97, 119, 128–29n268, 159, 173, 179–80, 214, 218, 221, 227–29, 231, 237n213, 237, 246, 265n345, 273, 305, 334n111, 360, 360n229, 362, 364n255, 365–67, 370, 392, 411, 416n211, 428–30

at Qumran 142n349

better 422, 425

Salvation 295–96, 299–300, 303–4, 303n129, 303n130, 309n158, 310, 333, 358n222, 400

Samuel 233n194, 339n127

Sanctuary, see also Temple 90–91, 90n54,

- 100, 100n109, 109n162, 112, 112n174, 115n193, 171n146, 172–74, 173n153, 173n157, 174n159, 181, 186n213, 187n222, 202, 206, 210, 216, 216n102, 233n194, 249n277, 249n278, 264, 270n6, 304n133, 310, 321n43, 323, 380n49, 382n60, 398n141, 399, 401n154, 402–4, 408n183, 411, 423, 425n245, 426n252, 427n256

- earthly 5, 6, 105n138, 141n347, 215, 236n208, 236n211, 402–3, 410n95, 411–16, 414n206, 419, 422–27, 425n245, 430n268, 432

eschatological, see Temple, eschatological

eternal 153n44, 400, 400n150, 400n151, 414n206, 433

- heavenly 4, 6, 75–77, 116n196, 117, 118, 129, 135n311, 136–37, 136n312, 136n313, 137n321, 138n326, 139, 148–49, 153n44, 154n52, 185n211, 186–89, 236n211, 237–38n217, 283, 283n42, 319, 319n31, 356n211, 360–61, 361n239, 362n243, 370, 373n16, 380n53, 382n60, 383, 385n77, 389n95, 391n112, 395, 394n127, 395, 398–406, 402n157, 406n172, 408n183, 408, 411, 414–16, 414n206, 417–21, 424–27, 424n239, 424n240, 424n242, 425n243, 425n245, 430n268, 431

interim, see Temple, interim

wilderness, see Tabernacle

- Sanctum
 Inner, see also Holy of holies 129–30,
 131–32, 131n282, 135–36, 170n138
- Sarah 339, 341
- Satan 76n245, 181
- Saul, King 159, 194n257, 232, 233n194,
 367n267
- Septuagint 10, 21–22, 32n15, 44–45, 44n76,
 46, 49, 49n108, 49n111, 177n179
- Seraphim, see Cherubim
- Sheol 234n198
- Shrine, see Sanctuary
 inner, see Holy of holies
- Sibylline Oracles 59–60, 77–78, 241–50,
 242n239, 264, 265, 266
- Similitudes, Book of the, see Parables, Book
 of the
- Simon the High Priest 36–43, 37n42, 38n44,
 41–43, 50n118, 53, 377n32, 399n143
- Sin, sins 73–74, 73n228, 73n230, 73–74n231,
 282n39, 283–85, 335, 336, 379, 392,
 393n119, 410, 411, 422, 425, 428–29
- Sinai/Horeb 147, 151, 151n37, 156–57, 171,
 173–74, 176, 214n92, 215–16, 226–29,
 228n171, 255, 343, 344–47, 344n151,
 345n153, 352–53, 352n191, 353n196,
 355n205, 356–57, 357n213, 381n53,
 410n194, 434
 as a temple 151n37, 229, 231, 231n183, 233
- Sirach 27, 29, 29–43, 77, 78–79, 94n73, 312n7
- Solomon 55–56, 58, 63n185, 87, 137, 147n19,
 159, 194n257, 195n262, 202n16, 204,
 216–17, 239n226, 257–60, 258n318,
 262n328, 321, 324n63, 331, 367n267,
 381n57, 405, 405n70, 407n176
- Wisdom of 55–59, 77
- Son
 Davidic 314
 of God 139, 277–85, 277n10, 278n14,
 280n24, 285n54, 287–95, 291n84, 311,
 312n7, 379, 388, 392, 393n120, 433
 of man 164–65, 164n112, 169n136, 170,
 276n5, 287n61, 298–99, 298n109,
 300n119, 301n123
- Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 52n126,
 102n117, 110, 117, 117n202, 117n204,
 118n210, 119–20, 124n240, 127–43,
 127n264, 154n52, 169n136, 277n13,
 315n18, 349n174, 372n11, 391n109, 434
- Songs of the Sage 123–26
- Space, sacred 319n32, 381–82
- Spirit 318, 400
 evil 124, 126
 Holy 295–96, 414
- Suffering 308n154, 309n158, 310n162,
 359n227, 360, 363
- Synagogue 10–11n46, 17, 65–66, 66n195,
 168n132, 323n58, 359n227
- Tabernacle/tent 1–2, 23, 29, 57, 57n153,
 59n163, 70, 79n2, 89–91, 112n174, 136–37,
 136n315, 137n321, 144n2, 154n51, 158,
 158n76, 158n77, 160–61, 162, 163,
 163n107, 172–74, 187, 193–94, 193n256,
 194n257, 194n259, 197–98, 199, 210,
 215n100, 218n111, 222n134, 223–24,
 236–37, 236n208, 241, 255–57, 261, 266,
 272n18, 321, 321n42, 330–31, 340n132,
 356n211, 359, 360n230, 361–62, 362n243,
 369, 375–76, 378–80, 379n46, 380n49,
 380n50, 387, 394n126, 401, 401n154,
 401n155, 402, 403n162, 404–5, 407n176,
 408, 410, 412–14, 415n207, 416–17,
 420–21, 420n224, 422, 426n247, 427,
 426n248, 426n252, 428n261, 433–34
 construction and design of 67–70, 78,
 138, 138n327, 210n70, 215, 215n98,
 234–35, 255–57, 312n7, 374n23, 405,
 405n170, 406n172, 415, 420n222, 434
 cosmic symbolism 69–70, 256–57,
 256n309, 261, 266
 in heaven 59n163, 135–36, 135n311,
 137n320, 142, 283n42, 315n21, 340n132,
 358n222, 372n11
 linked with temple 16, 34, 34n23, 57n156,
 78, 79n2, 89n48, 90–91, 174, 194n257,
 236–37, 361–62, 362n243, 376n29
 veil/hangings of 136–37, 137n316, 142,
 256, 383, 386
- Tabernacles, Feast of/Sukkot 121n225
- Temple 2, 63n185, 70n212, 73, 73n227, 78, 90,
 114–16, 146n11, 147–48, 152n41, 153, 154,
 154n51, 154n52, 155, 159n79, 164, 170,
 172–74, 173n153, 176, 178n179, 182n197,
 182n200, 187, 195n262, 196n266, 197,
 202, 205n32, 206–7, 209–10, 210n66,
 210n67, 210n71, 211n74, 211n75, 211n77,
 213n88, 218n111, 224–25, 224n146,

Temple (cont.)

- 227n168, 228, 235–37, 236n206,
236n207, 237, 238n221, 240n229, 241,
242–44, 243n245, 243n246, 243n247,
249n277, 249n280, 253n298, 254,
261n324, 262, 263n335, 264–65,
265n346, 266n348, 266n349, 269,
269n1, 270–73, 271n12, 272n18, 307, 313,
315n19, 316n22, 320–23, 323n58, 325n64,
325n67, 327n76, 330–31, 331n94, 332,
334, 334n111, 336, 340n132, 347–48,
356n211, 359n228, 360n230, 362n243,
364n255, 365–66, 365n259, 374n20, 376,
376n30, 378, 380n49, 381, 381n57,
397–98, 398n138, 399n147, 401, 401n155,
404–5, 404n167, 406n172, 408, 410,
410n193, 410n195, 412, 419, 420n224,
426n247
- archetypal 88, 330n90, 369, 400n150,
400n151, 419, 427, 427n254, 433–34
- community as a temple 79n2, 80–81,
80n5, 80n8, 82n18, 83–84, 84n26,
85–86, 86n38, 86n39, 88, 88n46, 92n66,
97, 98–99, 100, 101n109, 102–4, 104n131,
110, 114, 116, 116n198, 123, 124–25, 126,
126n256, 143, 206n45, 349n174, 434
- cosmic symbolism 65n193, 77–78, 94n74,
210, 210n72, 211n76, 213–14, 214n94,
216–17, 218, 245, 258, 260–61, 266,
330–31, 330n90
- destruction of 88n47, 162, 179–80, 182,
183, 187n219, 193n250, 200, 202, 202n15,
208n53, 208n54, 210, 211–13, 211n77,
213n87, 213–14, 214n94, 216–17, 218,
219n116, 224–25, 226, 227, 227n168,
228n172, 230–31, 231n183, 233n191,
235–37, 235n205, 240, 242, 242–43n244,
244–47, 250, 251–53, 251n283, 257,
259–60, 262–64, 262n326, 265–66, 271
- eschatological 1, 2, 4, 7, 9–10, 27–28, 43,
50, 57, 58, 64, 75, 78, 79n2, 80–81, 80n5,
83–84, 83n20, 84n25, 84n26, 85–86,
85n29, 86n38, 88, 88n46, 90n54, 91,
92–94, 92n66, 94n78, 95–97, 104n131,
126n258, 135–36, 143, 144, 160–61,
160n86, 160n89, 162–64, 163n106,
167n125, 168, 168n130, 170, 172–74,
172n149, 173n155, 174n161, 178–79, 182,
197, 199, 204, 207n49, 212–13, 212n84,
212n85, 214, 214n94, 215n100, 225,
231–32, 235–37, 240–41, 241n232,
248–49, 249n279, 264–66, 272–73, 278,
310, 311, 315n21, 316, 319, 342–43,
354n199, 355–56, 358, 377, 390, 398,
398n138, 400, 404n165, 410n194, 411,
415n206, 420, 434–35, 435n3
- eternal 94n78, 400, 400n150, 400n151
- Ezekiel's visionary temple 7, 35n26, 91,
95–97, 137, 144, 144n1, 168, 380
- in heaven/heavenly/celestial 1, 4, 5–10,
16–17, 27–28, 31–32, 56–58, 64, 79n2,
80n5, 84, 84n26, 88, 102, 107–8, 110,
113–14, 116, 118n207, 119, 122n231, 123,
126, 127–28, 128–29n268, 129–30,
132n290, 133, 133n293, 133n294, 135–36,
136n312, 137, 141n347, 142–43, 144,
144–45n3, 146, 148–49, 148n19, 151–53,
151n37, 151n38, 152n39, 153n43, 153n44,
153n46, 154–55, 166, 167–68, 167n125,
169–70, 172, 184–91, 197, 199, 200n7,
204–5, 205n32, 210n70, 211, 211n76,
212n85, 213, 215–16, 218, 218n111,
221–25, 222n134, 227n168, 229, 229n177,
237–38, 241, 243, 250, 253n298, 257,
266, 310, 315–16, 319, 319n31, 333, 344,
344–45n152, 349–52, 349n174, 368, 369,
376n30, 378, 381, 381n56, 381n57,
382–83, 386–88, 386n80, 391, 391n109,
391n112, 395, 404–11, 412, 414–15,
416n211, 419, 433–34
- interim temple/Temple of Adam 85–86,
86n38, 86n39, 90n54, 91, 92, 125n249,
126n258, 143, 434
- Leontopolis 72n224
- linked with tabernacle, see Tabernacle
- of Solomon 5–6, 28, 56–57, 61–62,
62n177, 63, 78, 79n2, 83–84, 83n23,
85–86, 89–90, 89n48, 89n49, 91, 137,
144n2, 147–48n19, 148n20, 153, 159,
160–61, 162–64, 163n104, 163n106, 174,
182, 193–94, 194n258, 197, 200–201,
200n7, 202n16, 203n17, 204, 212n84, 214,
215, 215n100, 218, 235–37, 237n213, 238,
250, 257–61, 262n328, 265–66, 307n151,
320n37, 321, 323n58, 327, 353, 353n198,
381n57, 405, 433
- relationship between earthly and
heavenly temple 4, 6–7, 9–10, 16–17,

- 23, 29, 33–34, 43, 56–58, 56n152, 57n153, 57n155, 57n157, 70, 74, 74n234, 77, 80–81, 80n6, 80n8, 107–8, 110, 116, 118–19, 123, 130, 130n276, 130n278, 133, 138n327, 142, 143, 144, 147, 147n19, 151–52, 153n44, 154–55n52, 174n160, 174n161, 183, 185–86, 191, 203, 211n76, 229, 229n177, 231–32, 235n204, 236n211, 238, 272n18, 395
- repair of 39–41, 47–49
- Second/Jerusalem/Herod's Temple 1, 4, 16–17, 17n81, 19, 23, 27–28, 30, 38, 43, 44, 46–51, 61, 61n174, 61n175, 62, 63–64, 64n187, 65–67, 65n193, 66n195, 70, 71, 72, 72n224, 77, 79n2, 79n3, 81, 83–86, 83n23, 90n53, 99, 100–101, 101n109, 101n112, 105n138, 128–29n268, 130, 141n347, 144, 144n2, 144–45n3, 146, 148n20, 153–55, 159, 163, 163n109, 168, 172, 172n148, 173, 174n160, 178, 179, 182, 183, 189, 186n214, 195–96, 195n263, 197, 199, 201, 211n76, 212–14, 212n84, 213n89, 217, 218, 218n111, 220–21, 222n134, 229, 235–37, 236n208, 240n230, 241, 241n232, 242, 255n303, 260–61, 265–66, 271–73, 272n18, 323n57, 323n58, 325, 327, 353, 353n198, 356, 356n212, 358, 358n223, 381, 394, 401, 404–5, 410n195, 423n231, 429n262, 433–34
- spiritual temple 110n165
- symbolism/imagery 1, 5–10, 23, 30, 31–32, 88, 88n45, 98, 100, 103–4, 107–8, 110, 110n165, 111, 111n168, 118, 143, 145, 153n43, 157, 164n112, 183, 183n203, 197–98, 207n48, 213, 237n215, 273, 311, 314–16, 343, 345n152, 350–52, 359, 359n227, 359n228, 368, 369–70, 381–82, 382n59, 385–86, 387, 421, 433
- Third/restored temple 81, 115n195, 159–60, 167n125, 172, 172n148, 197, 199, 212–13, 212n85, 212n86, 214, 228n172, 231–32, 241, 248–49, 265, 434
- veil of 38–39, n48, 41, 50, 69, 136–37, 179n182, 213n89, 261, 348, 372n11, 382n60, 384–86, 385n75, 385n77, 387, 389–97, 389n95, 391n109, 391n111, 421
- Temple Scroll 79n2, 81, 89–94, 96–97, 95n79, 96n87, 96n88, 96n89, 96n90, 143, 159n79
- Tent, see also Tabernacle 341n135
- tent of meeting 323n57, 363n248, 380n50, 402n158
- tent of witness 402n158
- true/greater/more perfect 4–5, 10, 36, 59, 88, 136, 250, 294, 315n21, 336, 348, 356n211, 378, 395, 397–98, 398n140, 400–404, 400n150, 400n151, 404n165, 412, 414n205, 417, 419–21, 421n226, 426
- Thanksgiving Hymns, see Hodayot
- Throne 189n232, 205n32, 331, 379–80, 379n46, 397, 398n137
- Chariot, see also Merkabah 52n126, 138n324, 139–40, 153, 229–30
- in heaven 111n168, 115n193, 138, 138n324, 139–40, 139n328, 142, 153n44, 155, 227, 227n168, 229, 229n175, 283, 378n37
- linked with temple 229
- of God 76, 124, 139n337, 142, 153n44, 156–57, 169–70, 169n136, 190–91, 190n235, 190n238, 225, 226, 230, 230n180, 253n298, 276n9, 277n13, 312n7, 344n152, 372n11, 378, 396–97, 411
- of grace 225n154, 370, 378, 381n53
- Throne room of God 137n321, 151, 153n44
- Torah 89n48, 96n89, 164, 193, 199n2, 202n13, 205n32, 207, 207n51, 209, 233n191, 269, 270–71, 366n262, 405
- Tree of life 157
- Universe/cosmos as a temple 6, 29, 39–41, 41–42, 57, 57n154, 58, 70, 70n212, 78, 80n8, 93–94, 94n74, 236, 256, 259, 325n68, 330–32, 332n95, 336, 434
- Unleavened bread, Feast of 121n225
- Uriel 201, 201n11, 203–6
- War in heaven 104–5, 105n142, 107n151
- War Scroll 104–8, 349n174
- Warning passages in Hebrews 4, 295–96, 327–28n76, 352–53, 388–89
- Watchers 75n243, 76n245, 145, 149–52, 154, 156, 172, 222n137
- Book of the 145–57, 145n5, 171n145, 180n187, 183
- Wilderness 147–48, 237, 294–95, 294n96, 304, 316, 325n64, 362n243
- camp 158, 159n79, 160–61, 360, 400
- Israel in wandering 33, 158, 316n25, 317, 320, 320n38, 322, 323n57, 326–27, 329,

Wilderness (cont.)

332, 336n117, 337n120, 339n127, 342n143,
375, 403-4

Wisdom 31-32, 181n192, 323n58

Wisdom literature 29-30

World 290-93, 291n80, 294n94, 357n220,
391n111

to come/heavenly world 3, 4, 5, 204,
183n32, 273, 274-75, 291n79, 292-95,
292n87, 294n94, 296-98 296n104,
298-99, 298n109, 300, 310, 311, 316n25,
319, 333n106, 336, 340n131, 340n134, 348,
387, 391n112, 398, 410, 433-34

inhabited world 110n166, 290-94,
291n79, 357

Worship 130

of Adam 37n44

Yahoel 226-29, 227n168, 229n173, 230n180,
284n51

Zerubbabel 159n81, 398n138

Zion 72, 108, 157n69, 172, 172n151, 173n153,
176, 197, 201-3, 206, 206n40, 206n42,
210, 215-17, 215n99, 215n100, 218n110,
228, 228n171, 228n172, 231n183, 275,
323n57, 331, 341n135, 343-52, 344n150,
345n153, 351n185, 376

mount 157, 172n148, 173-74, 213, 294,
346n155 347n164, 348n172, 349n174,
351

heavenly 5, 203, 205n32, 206n42, 207,
341n135, 343-52, 347n164, 348n172, 355

Index of Authors

- Aalen, Sverre 312n9, 314n13
Abegg, Martin G. 113n182, 113n183, 113n185,
121n225, 123n233
Achteemeier, Paul J. 426n249, 427n254
Adams, Edward 2n5, 59n163, 291n79, 291n81,
354n204, 355n207, 356n210, 356n211,
357n216, 372n12
Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw 14n65, 16n75
Albl, Martin C. 292n86
Alexander, Philip S. 6n21, 75n237, 81n10,
85n30, 98n94, 98n95, 100n106, 102n119,
113n180, 115n195, 117n202, 117n203,
121n223, 122n231, 124n238, 124n241,
124n242, 127n263, 127n264, 128n265,
128n266, 131n284, 132n287, 132n290,
133n295, 133n296, 134n297, 134n303,
134–35n304, 135n308, 135n309, 136n312,
137, 137n317, 137n320, 137n321, 139,
139n334, 140n341, 155n53, 184n208,
228n170
Allegro, J. M. 81, 81n11, 82n13, 84n25,
84–85n27, 85n30, 86n39, 87n41, 180n188
Allen, David L. 356n210, 356n212, 358n225,
399n145
Allen, David M. 286n59, 287n60, 289n68,
289n71, 292n87, 295n97, 297n107,
304n133
Allison, Dale C., Jr. 52n126
Andersen, Francis I. 70–71, 70n213,
70–71n214, 71n217, 71n218, 71n219,
73n227, 73n228, 73n229, 73n230,
74n235, 75n241, 75n243, 76n248,
76n249, 77n250, 147n19, 287n61
Anderson, David R. 275n6
Anderson, Gary A. 47n99, 175n165, 175n166,
176n169
Andreasen, Niels-Erik A. 33n93, 334n110
Andrews, H. T. 46n89, 54n136
Andriessen, Paul C. B. 288–89n68, 289n71,
294n96, 295n97, 311n1, 384n70, 384n73
Arowele, P. J. 345n154, 350n180
Assefa, Daniel 160ng1
Attridge, Harold W. 9, 9n40, 11n46, 11n49,
13n57, 13n61, 14n65, 14n67, 15, 15n74,
16n75, 58n160, 87n41, 254n301, 255n304,
256n307, 263n330, 263n331, 263n332,
263n335, 264n337, 270n5, 270n6,
272n18, 275n1, 276n9, 279n21, 280n24,
280n26, 283n41, 284n49, 285–86n54,
286n59, 288, 288n68, 289n69, 289n72,
291, 291n80, 294n94, 295n100, 296n101,
296n102, 300n120, 301n123, 302n128,
303n129, 304n134, 305n142, 308n156,
309n157, 309n158, 310n162, 313n11,
314n13, 315n17, 315n18, 315n19, 315n21,
316n21, 316n23, 317n27, 319n32, 319n33,
327n72, 327n74, 328n78, 329n82,
332n96, 332n98, 333n102, 334n107,
335n113, 337n118, 338n121, 338n122,
340n131, 346n159, 347n163, 348n168,
349n172, 350n177, 350n179, 350n183,
355n207, 358n225, 359n227, 359n228,
361n242, 362n245, 364n254, 365n258,
367n268, 371n9, 377n32, 379n43,
381n55, 383n66, 383n68, 384n71,
384n74, 385n77, 387n88, 389n93,
389n95, 390n103, 391n109, 393n119,
395n129, 398n139, 399n146, 402n156,
402n157, 404n167, 406n172, 409n188,
412n196, 413n198, 414n202, 414n203,
415n207, 415n208, 415n209, 417n213,
417n214, 418n215, 419n218, 419n219,
421n228, 423n231, 423n232, 424n238,
424n240, 425n243, 426n247, 427n254,
428n259, 429n263, 429n264, 431n274
Auffret, Pierre 352n191
Baillet, M. 121n225, 121n227, 122n231,
123n233, 124n238, 125–26, 125n246,
126n251
Baldwin, Joyce G. 398n137, 398n138
Balz, Horst 292n86, 295n97
Barbu, Daniel 49n106, 50n15
Barclay, John M. G. 44n80, 47n98, 55n142,
56n148, 59n164, 61n170, 63n184,
244n248, 245n254, 246n259, 254n299,
254n300, 254n301, 255n305, 257n310,
262n327, 263n330, 264n342, 265n345,
265n347

- Barker, Margaret 6n19, 58n159, 80n8, 80n9,
94n74, 115n193, 136n312, 142, 142n351,
175n162, 284n51, 330n90
- Barnard, Jody A. 1n2, 68n201, 71n220,
72n225, 117n203, 127n260, 127n264,
129n268, 129n269, 130n273, 132n284,
135n309, 144–45n3, 149n24, 166n124,
169n137, 170n138, 172n150, 183n202,
184n208, 276n9, 277n13, 283n41, 284n51,
287n61, 292n85, 315n17, 315n18, 333n107,
343n148, 345n154, 352n188, 371n9,
372n11, 373n16, 379n43, 381n55, 385n77,
386n78, 386n79, 387n87, 391n109,
391n112, 402n157, 405n168, 409n188
- Barr, James 145n5, 147n16
- Barrett, C. K. 9n39, 65n192, 329n83, 345n154,
348n171, 400n150, 430n273
- Barrett, David P. 13n60
- Bartels, K. H. 288n67
- Barton, Stephen C. 47n98
- Bateman, Herbert W. iv 290n76
- Bauckham, Richard 61n170, 80n5, 125n247,
132n284, 139n337, 140n340, 191n241,
221n129, 222n137, 232n187, 245n253,
245n254, 246n258, 251n283, 264n341,
265n346, 276n8, 283n41, 284n45,
284n51, 286n54, 286n59, 287n61,
288n68, 292n86, 394n124
- Bauernfeind, O. 390n108
- Baugh, S. M. 338n121, 338n122, 342n144
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 84–85n27, 86n37,
86n39, 100n106, 121n227, 129n269,
142n349, 175n164
- Bautch, Kelley Coblentz 151n37, 157n69
- Beal, Timothy 20n97
- Beale, G. K. 6n19, 7n25, 7n26, 8n28, 8n36,
9n37, 35n32, 94n78, 100n106, 141n343,
175n162, 206n45, 330n90, 331n93,
358n221, 358n223, 401n154, 404n165
- Beasley-Murray, George 51n121, 401n152
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. 30n1, 36n36, 40n54,
324n63
- Begg, Christopher T. 228n169, 257n315,
258n318, 258n319, 259n320
- Behm, Johannes 418n217, 422n229
- Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl 14n64
- Ben Zvi, Ehud 148n19
- Bergsma, John S. 171n145
- Berner, Christoph 163n106
- Bernstein, M. 64n189
- Best, Ernest 309n159
- Betz, Otto 85n30, 341n135
- Beyer, Klaus 158n74
- Bhayro, Siam 145n5, 148n21, 149n26
- Bickerman, E. J. 46n91
- Bidawid, R. J. 201n10
- Bietenhard, H. 141n347
- Billerbeck, Paul 291n79
- Bissoli, Giovanni 92n66
- Black, David Alan 12n55, 12n57
- Black, Matthew 112n173, 145n6, 145n7, 148n21,
151n35, 151n38, 152n39, 154n50, 158n76,
159n79, 159n80, 159n81, 160n90, 162n104,
163n107, 165n118, 165n121, 167–68n127,
168n130, 168n131, 170n140, 194n257
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph 34n24, 330n90
- Blomberg, Craig L. 298n108, 299n117
- Boccaccini, Gabriele 30n3, 34n22, 103n122,
145n5, 146n9, 149n28, 162n103, 171n145
- Bockmuehl, Markus N.A. 82n16, 120n220,
185n211, 305n142, 338n121, 341n137,
342n142, 342n144
- Bogaert, Pierre 209n61, 210n67, 212n84,
212n85, 214n94, 215n100, 236n208,
237n215, 238n218, 239n226, 240n227,
240n230, 240n231
- Bokser, Baruch M. 104n131
- Booras, Steven W. 84n25, 101n109, 106n144,
140n339
- Borgen, Peder 64n188
- Bornkamm, Günther 185n211, 274n1
- Borsch, Frederick H. 43n71, 299n111
- Böttrich, Christfried 71n214, 71n215, 71n216,
71n218, 72n220, 72n223, 73n229
- Bovon, François 288n66
- Bow, Beverly A. 71n214, 72n223
- Box, G. H. 30n5, 39n48, 40n54, 42n64,
202n14, 204n26, 205n32
- Brady, Cora 410, 410n191, 410n192
- Braude, William G. 323n57
- Braulik, Georg 320n38, 322n48
- Braun, H. 282n37, 313n11, 318n30, 329n84,
341n137, 342n139, 360n232, 362n243,
379n45, 393n119, 401n156, 417n213
- Brawley, Robert L. 338n124, 338n125
- Breech, Earl 202, 202n15
- Brekelmans, H. W. 107n148, 107n149, 131n284
- Brenner, Martin Leon 8n35

- Brockelmann, Carolo 215n99
- Brooke, George J. 64n189, 79n1, 79n2, 82n13, 82n16, 82n18, 83n20, 84n25, 84n26, 84–85n27, 85n29, 85n30, 86, 86n33, 86n34, 86n36, 86n37, 86n38, 86n39, 87n41, 89n49, 91n61, 91n62, 92n63, 93, 93n67, 93n70, 99n101, 99n105, 100–101n109, 115n193, 188n226, 278n20
- Broshi, M. 95n82, 95n85, 96n87
- Brown, Raymond E. 185n211
- Bruce, F. F. 6n19, 11n46, 11n49, 13n57, 14n65, 15n72, 16n76, 17n83, 58n160, 87n41, 270n6, 280n26, 286n59, 288n68, 289n72, 290n75, 292n87, 296n101, 297n105, 297n107, 301n123, 303n129, 304n136, 305n141, 310n161, 313n11, 323n58, 327n72, 327n75, 335n114, 340n133, 342n144, 345n154, 346n159, 349n172, 349n174, 350n177, 358n225, 360n233, 361n242, 364n255, 365n259, 370n5, 371n10, 379n43, 383n66, 384n71, 387n88, 389n93, 390n108, 391n109, 392n116, 399n146, 401n156, 409n187, 413n200, 415n207, 417n213, 418n217, 421n228, 424n238, 425n243, 427n257, 429n261, 430n271
- Buchanan, G. W. 14n64, 16n76, 303n129, 309n158, 316n21, 327n76, 340n131, 348n168, 358n224, 383n69, 392n115, 425n243
- Büchner, Dirk L. 307n147
- Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd 59n164, 60n167, 60n168, 60n169, 61n170, 62n176, 62n178, 62n180, 63n181, 63n183, 63n184, 63n185, 64n187, 187n219
- Bultmann, Rudolph 390n103, 400n150
- Burge, Gary M. 365n259
- Burkes, Shannon 55n145
- Burkitt, F. Crawford 151n38
- Burtness, J. H. 65n192
- Burton, Ernest de Witt 345n153
- Burton, Gideon O. 402n156
- Caird, G. B. 288n68, 291n81, 292n86, 298n110, 357n214
- Calaway, Jared C. 1n2, 132n289, 156n62, 189n228, 312n9, 319n32, 321n39, 326n70, 327n72, 334n107, 370n3, 371n7, 402n156
- Callaway, Phillip R. 79n1, 91n59, 91n60
- Calvin, John 387n88
- Campbell, Constantine R. 15n70, 271n10, 276–77n9, 302, 302n126, 302n127, 328n77, 345n153, 374n22, 375, 375n24, 375n26
- Campbell, Jonathan G. 64n189, 82n13, 82n16, 82n18, 85n30
- Caneday, A. B. 289n72, 290n77, 291n82, 291n83, 292n85, 292n86, 292n87, 293n92, 295n97
- Caquot, A. 125n246, 126n251, 178n179
- Carlson, David C. 151n35, 154n50, 184n208, 192n248
- Carlsson, Leif 72n224, 73n231, 153n45, 155n56, 155n59, 169n136, 185n211, 191n239, 219n113, 223n142, 224n147, 227n168
- Casey, J. M. 345n155
- Cazeaux, Jacques 236n208, 237n215, 238n218, 239n226, 240n227, 240n230, 240n231
- Cathcart, Kevin J. 353–54n199
- Charles, J. Daryl 287n60
- Charles, R. H. 71, 71n215, 71n216, 147n16, 150n34, 151n38, 158n74, 158n75, 163n107, 167n129, 168n131, 168n132, 173n154, 176n169, 177n179, 184n208, 191n242, 192n244, 192n247, 193n250, 194n257, 195n262, 196n264, 196n267, 209n60, 214, 214n94, 215n100
- Charlesworth, James H. 37n44, 60n168, 81n9, 97n93, 97n94, 98n99, 99n103, 99n105, 100–101n109, 102n116, 103n121, 103n125, 103n126, 111n169, 113n184, 131n284, 164n113, 171n142, 177n177, 177n179, 200n5, 215n97
- Chazon, Esther G. 81n10, 112n172, 112n175, 121n225, 122n228, 122n229, 123, 123n233, 123n234, 123n236, 123n237, 124n241, 129n268
- Chester, Andrew 61n174, 61n175, 64n187, 243n244, 243n246, 244n248, 247n263, 248n273, 249n279
- Chialà, Sabino 164n112
- Childs, Brevard S. 152n41, 301n123
- Chilton, Bruce D. 217n107
- Church, Philip 1n3, 8n28, 14n66, 22n111, 34n23, 36n33, 81n11, 88n45, 89n47,

Church, Philip (cont.)

- 161n97, 234n195, 269n1, 314n15, 327n75,
342n141, 362n243, 364n255, 398n138,
401n155, 404n165, 414n201, 433n1,
433n2
- Chyutin, Michael 95n80, 95n85
- Clements, R. E. 8n34
- Clifford, R. J. 8n31
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee 270n4, 270n5, 271n7,
286n54, 295n97, 303n128, 303n129,
327n72, 358n225, 370n3, 370n5, 371n10,
373n16, 392n114, 414–15n206, 415n207,
425n243
- Cody, Aelred 58n160, 59n163, 355n207,
369n1, 372n12, 384n70
- Coggins, R. J. 204n27
- Cohn, Leopold 232n187, 232n188
- Collins, Adela Yarbrow 147n14, 169n137,
184n208, 192n247
- Collins, John J. 30n1, 31n7, 31n11, 33n21,
39n48, 45n86, 47n97, 55n147, 59n164,
60n165, 60n167, 60n168, 60n169, 61n170,
61n171, 61n172, 61n173, 61n174, 62n176,
62n180, 63n181, 63n184, 64n187, 71n215,
71n216, 72n223, 74n234, 75n242, 76n245,
79n1, 82n16, 87n43, 98, 98n96, 105n137,
105n140, 107n148, 112n177, 127n261,
127n264, 128n265, 130n274, 131n284,
135n304, 146n9, 149n29, 149n31, 152n42,
154n51, 156n64, 156n65, 157n68, 157n70,
164n112, 165n122, 169n135, 177n176,
184n208, 191n241, 191n242, 192n244,
192n248, 193n250, 195n263, 196n264,
200n5, 201n11, 202n14, 208n58, 209n61,
209n62, 209n63, 212n85, 214n94, 219n116,
220n119, 220n121, 221n129, 229n175,
231n184, 241n234, 241n235, 242, 242n236,
242n237, 242n238, 242n239, 242n241,
242–43n244, 243n245, 243n246,
243n247, 244n248, 244n249, 244n250,
244n251, 244n252, 245n253, 245n254,
245n255, 245n257, 246n261, 246n262,
247n263, 247n264, 247n265, 247n266,
247n267, 247n268, 248n270, 248n271,
248n272, 248n275, 249n278, 249n280
- Collins, Marilyn F. 212n81
- Colson, F. H. 68–69, 69n202, 69n205, 69n206,
400n150
- Comfort, Philip W. 13n60

- Coppens, E. 275n6
- Cornely, R. 57n154, 58n158
- Cosby, M. R. 337n118, 338n123, 339n128
- Coxe, A. Cleveland 220n119, 397n135
- Craigie, Peter C. 280n28, 280n29, 301n123
- Crawford, Sidnie White 64n189, 95n80,
95n81, 96n90, 97n91
- Cross, Frank Moore 8n32, 99n103, 142n349,
152n42, 158n74
- Culler, Jonathan 20n97
- Cullmann, Oscar 9n41
- Culy, Martin M. 302n126
- D'Angelo, M. R. 312n9, 313n10, 313n11, 313n12,
314n13, 315n21, 339n128, 406n172
- Daniélou, Jean 69n207, 69n210, 256n310
- Daschke, Derek 220n121, 220n126, 221n129,
225, 225n152, 225n155
- Davenport, Gene L. 172n152, 173n155, 173n156
- Daids, Peter H. 426n249
- Davidson, A. B. 19n91
- Davidson, Maxwell J. 80n9, 85n27, 103n122,
103n123, 104n134, 105n137, 105–6n142,
107n151, 112n172, 112n176, 112n177,
113n179, 116n198, 125n246, 126, 126n253,
126n256, 127n264, 128n266, 132n284,
132n287, 154n47, 157n70
- Davidson, Richard M. 391n109, 426n252,
427n255
- Davies, G. H. 320n35, 320n37, 320n38
- Davies, John A. 8n36, 89n49, 91n59, 91n60,
92n63, 93n72, 94n74
- Davies, Philip R. 79n1, 82n16, 104n136,
105n137, 105n138, 107n149, 108n155
- Davies, W. D. 16n80, 101n111, 195n263, 323n55
- Davila, James R. 45n84, 61n170, 61n173,
61n174, 61n175, 116n200, 117, 117n202,
117n203, 118n207, 118n208, 118n209,
118n211, 119n213, 120n219, 122n229,
122n231, 123n233, 123n234, 124n243,
125n245, 125n248, 126n253, 126n256,
129n269, 129–30n272, 130n274, 130n276,
131n280, 131n283, 131–32n284, 132n285,
132n287, 134n297, 134n300, 134n304,
135n305, 135n307, 135n308, 135–36,
136n312, 136n313, 136n314, 138n324,
138n327, 139, 139n331, 139n333, 139n335,
139n336, 140n341, 140–41n343, 141n348,
142n350, 165n114, 177n178, 191n241,

- 193n252, 199n2, 200n4, 207–8n51,
208n53, 208n57, 208n58, 241n234,
242n242, 244n249, 244n252, 247n269
- Dean-Otting, Mary 71n215, 74n237, 76n246,
76n248, 76n249, 152n42, 153n44,
155n54, 177n176, 184n208, 185n211,
186n215, 189n234, 190n237, 220n123,
220n125, 221n131, 224n148, 227n168,
229n174, 304n136
- Decock, P. B. 166n123
- Dederling, S. 215n100
- Deichgräber, Reinhard 274n1
- De Jonge, H. J. 182n198, 183n204, 184n208
- De Jonge, Marinus 150n34, 176n171, 176n173,
176n174, 177, 177n176, 177n177, 177n178,
177–78n179, 179n181, 179n182, 179n183,
180n186, 180n189, 181n191, 181n195, 182,
182n198, 182n199, 183n201, 183n204,
184n207, 184n208, 185, 185n210, 185n211,
185n212, 185n213, 186n215, 187n220,
188n227, 188n228, 189n234, 190n235,
190n236, 190n237
- Delcor, M. 112n173
- Delitzsch, Franz 280n24, 289n71, 299n117,
309n158, 327n74, 371n9, 379n44,
380n48, 385n77, 389n95, 393n119,
400n150, 402n157, 406n172, 406n172,
425n243
- Delling, G. 304n137, 305n142, 307n149,
307n150, 308n154, 309n159
- DesCamp, Mary Therese 232n188, 232n190,
233n191
- DeSilva, David A. 10n45, 11n46, 14n65, 18n88,
55n141, 56n148, 56n149, 58n160, 87n41,
200n2, 200n5, 200n8, 202n13, 202n14,
205n39, 275n1, 284n49, 286n59, 288n68,
292n87, 296n103, 299n117, 303n129,
309n158, 319n32, 327n75, 336n117,
337n118, 342n139, 348n169, 352n191,
356n210, 360n232, 364, 364n254, 371n9,
372n12, 377n32, 384n70, 391n109,
393n116, 398n140, 399n146, 406n172,
417n213, 418n215, 424n238, 427n254
- De Souza, E. B. 6n20, 7, 7n24, 8n29, 9n37
- De Wet, Chris L. 301n123
- Dexinger, Ferdinand 162n102
- De Young, James Calvin 341n135, 348n172
- Di Lella, Alexander A. 30n1, 30n3, 31n6,
31n8, 31n11, 31n12, 33n18, 34n23, 34n26,
36n37, 40n54, 41n57, 41n58, 41n61,
42n64, 42n66
- Dillmann, August 158n75, 159n79, 160n90,
163n107
- Dimant, Devorah 8n28, 80n9, 83n23, 84n25,
84n26, 85n30, 85n31, 86n32, 86n39,
93n70, 93n71, 95n79, 97n94, 104n132,
104n136, 105n137, 111n167, 113n183,
125n249, 149n29, 150n33, 158n77, 159n79
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo 200n5
- Docherty, Susan E. 276n7, 279n23, 282n39,
285n53, 286n59, 312n9, 330n88, 332n96
- Doering, Lutz 45n86, 175n165
- Donadoni, S. 163n107
- Donaldson, Terence L. 157n69
- Doran, Robert 196n264
- Draper, J. A. 100n106
- Drawnel, Henryk 152n39, 178n179, 180n186,
184n207, 190n237
- Duhaime, Jean 104n136, 105n140
- Dunn, J. D. G. 16n75, 16n80, 18, 18n86, 18n87,
243n246
- Dunnill, J. 425n243
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 91n59, 112n173
- Dupont, J. 275n6
- Durham, John I. 8n31
- Eaton, John 276n3, 280n27, 280n28
- Eco, Umberto 21n99
- Ego, B. 30n3, 35n26, 35n27, 141n347
- Eisele, Wilfreid 292n87, 293n90, 294n94
- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle 12n55, 14n65,
14n67, 16n75, 18n88, 338n122
- Elgvin, Torleif 108n156, 109n158, 109n159,
109n163, 110n165, 110n166, 172n151
- Eliade, Mircea 6n22
- Elior, Rachel 145n3
- Ellingworth, Paul 10n45, 11n46, 11n48,
13n57, 14n65, 16n75, 17n83, 58n160, 270,
270n6, 271n7, 271n10, 272n15, 272n17,
272n18, 274n1, 276n8, 276n9, 279n23,
280n24, 284n49, 286n54, 286n59,
288n68, 292n87, 296n101, 297n107,
301n123, 303n128, 303n129, 305n141,
305n142, 305n143, 308n156, 309n159,
314n13, 315n17, 315n19, 315n20,
315–16n21, 319n32, 327n72, 327n74,
328n78, 329n81, 329n84, 329n85,
333n103, 334n107, 335n113, 335n114,

- Ellingworth, Paul (cont.)
 337n120, 338n122, 338n123, 339n130,
 341n135, 341n137, 341n138, 342n139,
 343n148, 344n149, 345n152, 345n154,
 346n155, 346n156, 347n164, 349n172,
 350n177, 351n184, 352n193, 353n194,
 355n207, 357n213, 357n214, 358n225,
 361n241, 362n243, 362n245, 365n258,
 366n261, 370n3, 371n9, 374n19, 377n32,
 379n43, 386n79, 389n95, 390n104,
 390n108, 391n111, 391n112, 392n114,
 393n122, 396n132, 399n145, 401n156,
 404n164, 406n172, 415n207, 415n209,
 416n210, 418n217, 419n218, 421n228,
 424n240, 425n243, 427n254, 428n260,
 429n261
- Elliott, John H. 426n249, 427n253, 427n254,
 428n258
- Endres, John C. 115n193
- Enns, Peter E. 316n25, 320n36, 320n38,
 330n89, 332n96, 335n114
- Eshel, Esther 124n241, 146n10, 148n21,
 148n22, 150n34, 151n35, 152n39, 178n179,
 180n186, 184n207, 190n237
- Eshel, Hanan 146n10, 148n21, 148n22,
 150n34, 151n35
- Eskola, Timo 169n136, 379n43
- Esler, Philip Francis 146n9, 202n15
- Evans, Craig A. 21, 21n106, 55n141, 110n164,
 244n249
- Evans, Trevor V. 345n153
- Eynikel, Erik 188n224
- Fabry, H.-J. 141n344, 141n345
- Falk, Daniel K. 121n225, 121n226, 121n227,
 122n229, 122n232, 123n237, 127n264,
 128n265, 129n269, 140n343
- Fanning, Buist 15n73, 302n126
- Farrar, F. W. 400n151
- Fearghail, F. Ó. 39n48, 42n66
- Fee, Gordon D. 290n75
- Felder, Stephen 59n164
- Feldman, Jackie 257n311
- Feldman, Louis H. 254n300, 256n308,
 257n312, 257n313, 257n314
- Field, Frederick 407n176
- Filson, F. V. 358n225, 361n239, 361n242
- Fischer, Bonifatius 199n1, 201n10
- Fishbane, M. 21n101, 330n90
- Fisher, Loren R. 202n16, 330n90
- Fisk, Bruce Norman 233n191, 235n205,
 236n207, 236n208
- Fitzmyer, Joseph 22n107, 81–82, 82n12,
 85n30
- Flender, O. 291n79, 431n276
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. 6n19, 31n8,
 31n11, 33n18, 33n19, 33n21, 34n24,
 34n25, 34n26, 35n28, 35n30, 37n41,
 37n42, 37n44, 38, 38n45, 38n47, 38n48,
 39n49, 40n50, 40n52, 40n53, 40n54, 41,
 41n55, 42n63, 42n64, 42n66, 42n67, 43,
 43n71, 43n72, 43n74, 54n139, 54n140,
 74n232, 74n233, 77n253, 80n6, 80n7,
 80n8, 80–81n9, 92n63, 105n138,
 106n143, 106n144, 106n146, 107n148,
 107n150, 107n151, 107–8, 108n153,
 108n155, 109n162, 111n171, 113n185,
 114–16, 114n186, 114n189, 114n191,
 115n193, 116n197, 116n198, 117n204,
 120n219, 120n220, 124n243, 125n246,
 125n250, 126n254, 126n256, 126n258,
 127n264, 128n267, 129n269, 130,
 130n277, 131n280, 131n284, 132n285, 133,
 133n291, 133n292, 133n293, 134, 134n297,
 134n299, 134n302, 134–35n304,
 135n306, 135n307, 135n308, 137, 137n321,
 138n324, 138n325, 139, 139n331, 139n337,
 141n343, 141n348, 142n349, 142n350,
 150n33, 188–89n228, 230n180, 233n193,
 233n194
- Flint, Peter W. 145n5
- Flusser, David 84n26, 85n28, 85n30
- Fohrer, G. 346n157, 351n85
- Forbes, Nevill 72n223, 287n61
- Fossum, Jarl E. 115n192, 230n180, 251n285
- France, R. T. 301n123
- Frankowski, Janusz 274–75n1
- Fredricks, Cathi J. 228n170
- Freedman, David Noel 8n30, 147n19, 151n37,
 233n194
- Frennesson, B. 80n4, 119n214, 124n241,
 125n249, 126n252, 126n255, 127n262,
 129n269, 129n271
- Fretheim, Terence E. 8n33
- Frevel, Christian 320n36, 323n58, 364n255
- Frey, J. 95n79, 95n80, 95n81, 95n82, 95n85,
 96, 96n89, 96n90
- Fritsch, Ch. T. 426n251

- Früchtel, Ursula 65n191, 65n193, 69n203
 Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald 65n193, 65n194, 79n3, 348n171
 Fuhrmann, Sebastian 299n115
 Fuller Dow, Lois K. 1n4, 8n35, 56n152, 97n92, 213n90, 228n170, 272n18, 333n105, 348n167, 362n247, 365n259
 Fyall, Robert 57n157
 Gäbel, George 3n11, 8n28, 57n155, 58, 60n169, 61n175, 62n179, 89n48, 91n61, 93n72, 102n120, 106n144, 113–14n185, 115–16, 115n195, 132n287, 133n293, 155n52, 167n125, 173n156, 189n229, 191n239, 206n42, 215n100, 236n206, 236n208, 238n221, 239n224, 243n246, 295n99, 299n117, 303n129, 305n142, 308n155, 342n141, 369n1
 Gagnon, Robert A. 97n94
 Galling, K. 37n10
 Gammie, John G. 45, 45n86, 46, 46n89, 46n90, 50, 50n114, 50n115, 50n116, 51, 51n122, 51n123, 52, 52n127, 52n128
 Gane, Roy E. 39n109
 García Martínez, Florentino 84n26, 89n48, 90n53, 91n61, 92n63, 95n79, 95n80, 95n81, 95n85, 96–97, 96n90, 96n91, 97n92, 139n333, 145n5, 149n25, 162n102, 163n109
 Gardner, Anne 85n27
 Garnet, Paul 98n95, 98n99, 99n103, 108
 Gärtner, Bertil 79n3, 84n26, 85n28, 85n30, 88n46, 102n120, 103n124, 104n128, 107n148, 108n154, 116n197, 207–8n51, 208n52, 316n22, 349n174
 Gaster, Theodore H. 134n299
 Gaston, LLOYD 249n279
 Gaylord, H. E. Jr. 219n113, 219n114, 219n115, 219n116, 220n119, 220n124, 221, 221n132, 223n142, 223n144, 224n146
 Geffcken, J. 60n165, 60n168, 61n170, 62n178, 63n181, 63n183, 243n245, 245n256, 246n260, 249n277
 Gelardini, Gabriella 11n46
 Gelston, A. 84n24
 Georgi, Dieter 12n55, 14n65, 55n141, 55n142
 Gerstenberger, Erhard 323n58
 Gese, Hartmut 33n18, 33n19, 34n23
 Gheorghita, Radu 22n107, 286n59
 Gieschen, Charles A. 72n223, 73n226, 81n9, 114, 114n192, 125n250, 164n112, 165n118, 230n180, 272n18, 284n51
 Gilbert, M. 55n143, 55n144, 55n147, 56n150
 Ginzberg, Louis 38n45, 227n164, 239n226
 Gleason, Randall C. 316n25, 327n76
 Goff, Matthew 108n156, 108n157, 109n158, 109n159, 135n304
 Goldingay, John 152n41, 153n43, 276n2, 276n3, 280n27, 280n28, 286n55, 293n90, 302n128, 320n34, 320n36, 322n47
 Goldstein, Jonathan A. 192n249, 195n263, 196n264
 Goodenough, Edwin R. 69n203
 Goodman, Martin 45n83, 46n91, 60n165, 60n167, 60n168, 60n169, 61n170, 71n218, 79n2, 242n237, 242n240, 242–43n242, 244n248, 244n249, 244n250, 244n251, 262n327
 Goppelt, Leonhard A. 316n25, 426n249
 Gordon, Robert P. 2n7, 15n72, 272n18, 282n37, 299n117, 338n122, 348n168, 353–54n199, 364n255, 401n156, 403n164
 Görg, M. 8n36
 Goshen-Gottstein, Alon 37n41
 Gourgues, M. 275n6
 Grabbe, Lester L. 55n142, 55n143, 55n145, 55n147, 56n148, 200n5, 215n97
 Grässer, Erich 286n59, 289n69, 318n30, 327n74, 358n224, 359n228, 379n43, 428n261, 429n263
 Greenfield, Jonas C. 95n85, 150n34, 152n39, 178n179, 180n186, 184n207, 190n237
 Grelot, P. 157n69, 157n71
 Gribomont, Iohanne 199n1, 201n10
 Grierson, Fiona 191n241, 192n243, 192n244, 192n246, 193n250
 Grogan, Geoffrey W. 303n129
 Grossfeld, Bernard 205n32
 Grosvenor, Mary 424n239
 Gruen, Erich S. 45n82, 49n106, 54n138, 61n170, 78n254
 Gruenwald, Ithamar 154n51, 155n53, 156n61, 169n136, 185n211
 Gurtner, Daniel M. 39n48, 207–8n51, 208n52, 208n53, 208n55, 208n56, 208n57, 208n58, 209n59, 212n80, 215, 215n98, 215n99, 215n100, 391n109
 Guthrie, Donald 11n49, 11n50

- Guthrie, George H. 11n49, 11n50, 12n52, 12n53, 14n65, 22, 22n109, 22n110, 284n45, 284n50, 287n60, 292n87, 301n123, 304–5n137, 309n158, 314n13, 315n17, 316n23, 343n148, 347n162, 358n225, 384n71, 388n90, 394n127, 399n145, 424n238, 429n261
- Habel, Norman C. 152n40, 152n41, 153n43
- Haber, Susan 364n255
- Hacham, Noah 44n80, 47n97
- Hadas, Moses 44n77, 45n82, 45n86, 46, 46n89, 46n91, 46n93, 48n103, 52n124, 53n132, 54n138
- Hagen, Joost L. 71n220
- Hagner, Donald A. 14n65, 14n69, 17n83, 284n45, 329n83, 379n43
- Hahn, Scott W. 421–22n228
- Hall, Robert G. 226n163
- Hall, Stuart George 426n250
- Hallböck, Geert 200n5, 202n13
- Halperin, David 155n57, 155n59, 228n171, 230n180
- Halpern-Amaru, B. 238n221
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. 195n262, 203n17, 207n47, 211n76
- Hamm, Dennis 314n13, 337n118, 338n126
- Hanhart, Robert 427n254
- Hannah, Darrell D. 80n4, 116, 116n198, 141n347, 154n47, 284n51
- Hanson, R. P. C. 427n254
- Haran, M. 5n15, 57n156, 137n318
- Hardin, Michael 422n229
- Harlow, Daniel C. 218n112, 219n115, 219n116, 219n117, 219n118, 220, 220n122, 220n127, 221n128, 221n129, 221n131, 221n133, 222n135, 223n142, 224n146, 224n147, 225, 225n151, 225n152, 228n172
- Harrington, Daniel J. 31n6, 56n148, 64n189, 104n134, 108n156, 108n157, 109n159, 109n160, 109n162, 193n253, 200n5, 201n12, 212n85, 232n187, 232n188, 232n189, 232n190, 233n191, 233n192, 234n197, 234n199, 236, 236n206, 236n208, 236n209, 237n213, 237n215, 238n218, 238n219, 239n224, 239n226, 240n227, 240n230, 240n231
- Harris, Murray J. 285n54, 367n267
- Hartley, John E. 366n264
- Hatina, Thomas R. 20, 20n94, 21n100
- Hauspie, Katrin 188n224
- Hay, David M. 276n4, 275n6, 281n30, 281n31, 283n41, 284n49, 284n52, 292n86, 370, 370n4, 370n5, 393n119
- Hays, Richard B. 18n89, 21–22, 21n104, 21n105, 22n111, 22n112, 314n13, 364n255
- Hayward, C. T. R. 6n19, 34n26, 35n27, 37n42, 38n45, 40n50, 40n52, 40n54, 42n66, 50n117, 51n119, 52n126, 54, 54n133, 54n136, 54n137, 58n159, 67n197, 70n212, 175n163, 235, 235n203, 235n204, 236n211, 238n219, 239n225, 240n229, 256n307, 256–57n310, 265n345, 330n90
- Heidel, Alexander 331n93
- Heinemann, Isaak 65n193
- Helyer, Larry R. 44n78, 288n65, 288n68, 289n72, 291n84, 292n87
- Hempel, Charlotte 86n35, 98n94, 103n121, 103n126, 171n145
- Hengel, Martin 30n3, 36n34, 275n6, 284n51, 318n28
- Henze, Matthias 162n103, 208n51, 208n52, 209n59, 209n64
- Héring, J. 358n224, 377n32, 383n69, 392n115
- Hilber, John W. 276n3
- Hillers, Delbert R. 148n19
- Hilton, Naomi Henare 218n112
- Himmelfarb, Martha 30n3, 34n26, 37n42, 42n64, 71n216, 72n223, 72n224, 76n245, 77n252, 130n272, 141n346, 144n1, 146n9, 146n11, 149n25, 151n37, 152n40, 152n42, 153n44, 154–55n52, 155n56, 156n62, 159n84, 160n92, 163n109, 170n141, 175n164, 177n175, 178n179, 180n186, 187n220, 218n111, 219n116, 220n119, 220n121, 221n129, 221n132, 221n133, 222n137, 223n143, 227n165, 229n174, 229n176
- Hobbs, John F. 208n53, 209n59, 209n62, 210n72, 212n85, 218n110
- Hofius, Otfried 9n41, 167n125, 181n194, 204n27, 204n31, 205n37, 238n221, 318–19, 318n28, 319n31, 319n32, 320n35, 320n36, 320n37, 321n44, 321n45, 322n48, 322n49, 322n54, 323n57, 323n58, 325, 325n65, 327n74, 329n84, 333n101, 334n107, 334n108, 346n155,

- 384n69, 384n72, 385n76, 386n78,
386n80, 389n95, 390n107, 391n109,
394n124, 402, 402n157, 402n159,
415n209, 419n218, 419n219, 420n225
- Hofmann, Norbert Johannes 191n242,
192n243, 192n244, 192n245, 192n249,
193n250
- Hollander, H. W. 176n171, 176n173, 177n177,
177n179, 179n181, 179n182, 179n183,
180n189, 181n191, 181n195, 182, 182n198,
182n199, 183n204, 184n207, 184n208,
185, 185n210, 185n211, 185n212, 185n213,
186n215, 187n220, 188n227, 188n228,
189n234, 190n236
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend 112n177
- Holmes, Michael W. 14n65, 208n54,
360n237
- Holmes, Stephen R. 1n2
- Holtz, Gudrun 103n122
- Holtzmann, Oskar 37n10
- Honigman, Sylvie 45, 45n86, 46, 46n89,
46n90, 50, 50n114, 50n115, 50n116, 51,
51n122, 51n123, 52, 52n127, 52n128
- Hooker, Morna D. 1n2, 3n11, 299n117
- Horgan, Maurya P. 64n189, 85n31, 232n189
- Horsley, Richard A. 146n9, 150n34, 152n40
- Horton, F. L. 72n223
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar 288n68, 293n90,
293n91, 320n35, 320n36, 322n48,
322n54, 323n58
- Houtman, Cornelis 151n37, 233n194
- Howell, Maribeth 8n29, 8n36
- Hübner, H. 305n142, 307n149
- Hughes, Graham 9n41, 422n229
- Hughes, J. J. 421n228
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe 15n70, 270n5,
304n132, 309n158, 334n107, 349n172,
357n214, 361n242, 363n252, 364n255,
385n76, 385n77, 392n115, 399n145,
400n150, 403n164, 424n238
- Hultgård, Anders 115n93
- Human, Dirk, J. 320n34
- Humbert, J. -B. 142n349
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan 201n11, 205n39
- Hurowitz, Victor (Avigdor) 151n37, 330n90,
331n93
- Hurst, Lincoln D. 1n2, 6n19, 9n39, 57n154,
65n192, 68n201, 284n50, 286n59,
298n110, 299n113, 299n117, 304n137,
319n30, 346n158, 354n204, 355n208,
356n212, 400, 400n151, 405, 405n168,
407n177, 408, 408n181, 408n182,
408n183, 408n184, 409n188, 424n237,
425n243, 427n253, 427n254, 427n256,
427n257
- Hurtado, Larry W. 139n328
- Idel, Moshe 73n231
- Instone-Brewer, David 39n48, 42n66,
122n230
- Isaac, E. 163n107
- Isaacs, Marie E. 14n65, 16n75, 19n91, 315n19,
315n21, 334n107, 343n148, 358n224,
360n234, 360n237, 361n239, 361n242,
365n259, 393n122, 402n156
- Jackson, David R. 171n145
- Jacobson, Howard 232–33, 232n188,
232n189, 233n191, 233n192, 234n197,
234n199, 236, 236n206, 236n208,
236n209, 236n211, 237n214, 237n216,
237–38n217, 238n218, 238n219, 238n221,
239n226, 240n227, 240n230
- James, M. R. 219n116
- Janowski, Bernd 34n24
- Jastrow, Marcus 40n50, 136n314, 138n327,
141n347, 164n111, 190n237
- Jefferies, Daryl F. 108n156
- Jellicoe, Sidney 44n78, 46n89, 46n91, 46n92
- Jeremias, J. 384n72
- Jewett, R. 352n189, 352n190, 371n9, 378n38
- Johnson, Luke Timothy 9n41, 11n46, 13n57,
14n65, 17n83, 87n41, 272n16, 283n41,
284n51, 286n59, 292n87, 296n103,
303n129, 304n136, 305n141, 313n11,
315n17, 318n30, 328n76, 328n77,
337n118, 338n122, 339n127, 339n129,
342n144, 344n151, 346n156, 347n164,
348n167, 350n177, 352n187, 355n207,
360n232, 371n9, 383n66, 384n72,
385n75, 389n93, 389n95, 391n111,
391n112, 393n119, 398n140, 399n142,
399n146, 400n149, 402n156, 404n167,
406n172, 408n183, 414n202, 415n207,
422n230, 424n238, 424n240, 425n243,
427n254, 429n263
- Johnson, Richard W. 16n79, 361n242
- Johnsson, W. G. 345n155

- Johnston, George 304n137
 Jones, Kenneth R. 219n118, 220n119, 220n121, 220n125, 221n131, 225n156
 Jones, Peter Rhea 311n1, 343n148, 345n154
 Jongeling, Bastiaan 106n144
 Joslin, Barry C. 11n49, 418n217, 428n260, 428n261, 429n266

 Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. 327n75
 Kalengyo, Edison M. 1n2
 Kalimi, Isaac 228n170
 Kampen, John 79n3, 91n59, 91n60, 92n64
 Kapelrud, A. S. 330n90
 Käsemann, Ernst 9n41, 18n88, 284n49, 291n84, 301n123, 303n129, 304n137, 305n142, 306n145, 318–19, 318n28, 318n29, 318n30, 319n32, 334n108, 337n118, 339n129, 343n148, 350n176, 355n207, 371n9, 380n48, 384n69, 389n95, 391n11
 Katz, Peter 407n176
 Kaufmann, Stephen A. 314n13
 Kearney, Peter J. 34n24
 Kee, H. C. 179n181, 179n182, 180n190, 182, 182n198, 184n208
 Kim, Lloyd 18n86, 18n89
 Kinzer, Mark Stephen 299n113
 Kirschner, Robert 200n6
 Kistemaker, S. J. 275n6, 289n71, 299n114, 299n117, 329n82, 330n89, 371n10, 406n171
 Klein, Ralph W. 321n42
 Kleinknecht, Hermann 431n275
 Klijn, A. Frederik J. 201n10, 209n59, 210n66, 215n100
 Kline, Meredith G. 6n22, 382n60
 Klinzing, Georg 196n264, 349n174
 Knibb, Michael A. 98n99, 99n102, 100n106, 100n107, 100n108, 100n109, 101n110, 101n115, 145n5, 145n6, 150n34, 151n38, 158n76, 161n99, 161n101, 165n114, 165n115, 165n119, 169n135, 172n152, 173n155, 177n179, 184n207, 189n231, 202n13, 204n27
 Knohl, Israel 52n126
 Knox, Wilfred L. 304–5n137
 Koch, Klaus 164n112, 165n118
 Koester, Craig R. 6n19, 7n27, 10n45, 11n46, 13n57, 13n58, 13n59, 14n65, 14n67, 15, 15n74, 18n88, 35n28, 35n31, 55n142, 56n151, 58n160, 69n203, 69n209, 87n41, 90n51, 137n321, 138n327, 194n260, 195n261, 202n16, 256n310, 270n5, 272n16, 272n18, 275n1, 284n49, 284n50, 286n54, 286n59, 288n68, 289n72, 292n87, 294n94, 296n102, 299n117, 304n136, 305n140, 309n158, 312n9, 313n11, 314n16, 315n17, 319n32, 327n72, 329n84, 330n90, 335n114, 338n122, 339n130, 342n139, 343n148, 347n166, 348n171, 350n178, 356n212, 358n225, 359n228, 360n237, 361n242, 362n247, 363n251, 363n252, 364n253, 364n254, 371n10, 372n12, 379n43, 383n68, 384n72, 385n75, 386n79, 390n103, 390n108, 391n11, 393n116, 397n135, 399n146, 400n150, 401n156, 402n157, 404n167, 406n172, 408n180, 414n205, 415n207, 417n213, 424n238, 424n239, 425n243, 426n247, 427n254, 430n271
 Koester, Helmut 195n263, 338n121, 359n228, 360n231, 363, 363n252
 Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham 191n241, 195n262
 Kooij, Arie van der 37n39
 Koosed, Jennifer L. 12n55
 Korteweg, T. H. 182n198, 183n204, 184n208
 Kraus, Hans-Joachim 276n3, 280n28, 280n29, 293, 293n90, 293n91, 320n36, 322n46, 322n47, 322n54, 376n29
 Krauter, Stephan 64n190
 Kristeva, Julia 20, 20n93, 20n95
 Kugel, James 109–10, 110n164, 185n209, 190n235, 190n236, 250–51, 250n281, 251n283, 251n287, 252n288, 252n289, 252n290, 252n291, 252n292, 252n293, 252n294, 253n295, 253n296, 253n297
 Kugler, Robert A. 95n85, 176n171, 178n179, 180n186, 184n207, 184n208, 250n282
 Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang 84n27, 86n39, 112n172
 Kulik, Alexander 219n113, 219n115, 220, 220n120, 221n131, 222n136, 222n138, 222n139, 222n140, 223n142, 223n144, 224, 224n146, 224n147, 224n148, 224n149, 225n154, 226n157, 226n159, 226n161, 226n163, 227n167, 230n185, 284n51

- Kvanvig, Helge S. 145n5, 146n10, 149n25,
149n27, 150n33, 156n67, 157n68, 164n112,
165n118, 165n119, 169n135, 376n30
- Laansma, Jon C. 2n5, 204n29, 214n92,
318n28, 319n31, 319n32, 319n33, 321n42,
321n43, 321n44, 321n45, 322n47, 322n48,
322n53, 322n54, 323n58, 324n59, 325,
325n66, 325n67, 327n72, 327n73,
327n74, 329–30, 329n81, 329n84,
330n86, 331n93, 332n95, 332n96,
333n106, 334n107, 334n108, 334n111,
354n200, 355n207, 356, 356n211,
356n212, 358n221, 358n222, 358n223
- Laato, Antti 208n53
- Lampe, G. W. H. 19n91, 406–7n173
- Lanchester, H. C. O. 60n168, 60n169, 62n180,
241n234, 242n237, 244n249
- Lane, William L. 10n45, 11n46, 13n57, 13n61,
14n64, 14n65, 16n75, 17n83, 270n4, 272,
272n17, 275n1, 276n8, 279n22, 280n24,
280n26, 282n39, 283n41, 286n54,
286n59, 288n68, 289n72, 292n87,
294n94, 295n99, 296n101, 296n102,
297n106, 299n117, 301n123, 302n124,
302n128, 303n129, 304n133, 304n136,
304–5n137, 308n154, 309n159, 311n1,
312n5, 312n9, 313n10, 313n11, 314n14,
315n17, 315n21, 316n21, 317n27, 319n32,
327n72, 329n81, 329n82, 332n99,
335n114, 337n118, 338n121, 338n122,
339n128, 339n129, 339n130, 341n135,
341n136, 343n148, 344n149, 344n150,
346n157, 346n158, 347n164, 348n171,
349n172, 349n174, 350n177, 350n178,
351n184, 352n187, 352n191, 352n192,
353n194, 354n204, 355n206, 357n214,
358n221, 358n225, 359n227, 359n228,
361n242, 362n245, 362n247, 365n258,
365n259, 371n9, 380n52, 384n72,
385n75, 387n88, 389n94, 389n95,
390n103, 392n113, 393, 393n117, 394n124,
397n135, 398, 398n139, 399n146,
400n150, 401n156, 402n157, 403n164,
406n172, 412n196, 414n205, 415n207,
415n209, 417n213, 418n217, 419n218,
422n228, 423n232, 424n240, 425n243,
426n247, 427n257, 428n260, 429n261,
429n265, 430n271, 430n272, 430n273
- Lane, William R. 82n13, 86n39
- Lange, Armin 109n159, 109n162, 178n179
- Langkammer, H. 280n26, 288n66
- Laporte, Jean 69n209
- Larcher, C. 55n142
- Larson, Erik 145n5, 174n158, 176n169
- Lattey, C. 192n247, 193n250, 196n264
- Laurin, Robert B. 111–12n171, 113n178
- Leaney, A. R. C. 99n100, 99n102, 101n110,
101n114, 101n115, 120n222
- Lee, E. K. 1n2, 424n240
- Lee, Pilchan 75n241, 167n125, 167n128,
203n17, 204n27, 205n39, 206n44,
210n66, 219n117, 221n132, 221n133,
223n140, 225, 225n150, 225n153,
225n154, 227n166, 228n172, 229n176,
229n177, 230n182, 231n183, 231n184,
231n186, 237n216, 237–38n217, 238n221,
239n223, 240n229, 244n251, 245n254,
248n273, 248n274, 249n279
- Leemhuis, Fred 208n56
- Lehne, Susanne 17n83, 359n227, 361n239,
362n243
- Leithart, P. J. 315n19
- Lenglet, A. 331n93, 384n70, 384n73
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta 65n193, 65n194
- Leoni, Tommaso 262n327
- Leschert, Dale F. 299n111, 299n114, 301n123,
302n128, 317n27, 323n58, 332n99,
333n102, 333n103
- Leslau, Wolf 163n107
- Levenson, Jon D. 6n19, 6n22, 34n24, 80n8,
151n37, 152n42, 175n162, 195n262,
330n90, 331n93
- Levey, Samson H. 229n178
- Levine, Lee I. 16n79, 262n327
- Levison, John R. 37n44, 175n164, 176n168
- Lewis, Charlton T. 174n159
- Licht, J. 95n81, 95n82, 96n89, 112n172,
113n183, 192, 192n247, 192n248, 226n163
- Lichtenberger, Hermann 112n172, 200n5,
201n1, 202n13, 205n39, 206n42
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg 208n55, 209n61, 210n66,
214n96, 216n101, 216n103, 216n106,
216–17n107, 217n109
- Lim, Timothy H. 82n16
- Lincoln, Andrew T. 11n49, 16n75, 17n83,
319n30, 322n48, 329n82, 332n95,
334n107, 336n117, 346n155, 355n208

- Lindars, Barnabas 11n49, 14n65, 16n75,
17n83, 29n81, 299n117, 305n142,
310n162, 343n148, 359n227, 361n242,
365n260, 385n75, 385n77
- Lioy, Dan 6n22
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh 38n48
- Loader, William R. G. 175n165, 275n6,
280n26, 280n29, 281, 281n31, 288n68,
289n71, 291n84, 292n86, 301n123,
305n142, 308n154, 336n117, 359n227,
360n238, 361n242, 362n245, 364n255,
365n260, 391n111, 415n209, 418n215,
419n218, 425n243
- Lohfink, Norbert 9n37
- Löhr, Hermut 395n130
- Lohse, E. 106n144, 346n157, 351n185
- Lombard, H. A. 318n30, 321n39
- Long, Thomas 309n158
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 200n4, 200n5,
202n14, 205n38, 205n39, 206n42
- Longenecker, Richard 22n108, 388n91,
388n92
- Louw, Johannes P. 187n218, 408n185,
409n187
- Lucas, Alec J. 97n94
- Lucas, Ernest 242n236
- Lundquist, John M. 6n22, 80n8, 233n194,
330n90
- Lunt, H. G. 226n157, 226n159, 226n160,
226n161, 226n162, 250n281, 250n282,
251n283, 251n284, 252n289, 252n290,
252n293, 253n295
- Lust, Johan 188n224
- Lyons, W. J. 124n238, 124n241
- Macaskill, Grant 71–72n214, 74n231, 76n249,
287n61
- Mach, Michael 72n224, 77n251, 80n4,
112n175
- Mack, Burton L. 36n37, 36n38, 37n39,
41n59
- Mackie, Scott D. 9n39, 9n41, 11n46, 17n83,
284n49, 294n94, 301n123, 329n83,
354n204, 355n208, 379n43, 380n48,
382n61, 383n65, 415n209, 417n214,
419n218, 429, 429n265, 429n266,
431n274
- Macky, Peter W. 5n14, 5n15
- MacRae, George W. 65n192
- Maher, Michael 205n32
- Maier, Johann 89n48, 91n62, 92n63, 92n64,
112n175, 127n264, 128n265, 128–29n268,
129n269
- Manson, William 287n60, 304–5n137,
309n158, 361n241, 429n265
- Mansoor, Menahem 111n171
- Marböck, J. 31n8, 36n37, 36n38, 37n42
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández 407n176
- Marguerat, Daniel 262n326, 263n329,
263n330, 263n333, 264n336
- Martin, Matthew J. 64n190, 65n191, 65n193,
66n195, 66n196
- Martin, R. P. 407n173
- Mason, Eric F. 1n2, 82n16, 97n94, 103n121,
104n132, 113n183, 115–16, 116n196,
135n310, 282n38, 282n39
- Mason, Steven 254n299
- Mathewson, David 100n106
- Mayer, B. 389n95
- McCarter, P. Kyle Jr. 364n256
- McCullough, J. C. 406n171, 406n172
- McKane, William 147n19
- McKay, Kenneth L. 271n10, 302n126
- McKelvey, R. J. 85n30
- McKenzie, J. L. 175n162, 280n29
- McRay, John 424n241
- Meadowcroft, Tim 353–54n198, 354n202
- Mearns, Christopher L. 165n114
- Meecham, Henry G. 44n79
- Meeks, Wayne A. 233n194
- Meier, J. P. 275n1, 276n8, 277n11, 284n45,
284n49, 289n72, 292n87, 294n94
- Mendels, D. 90n53
- Metso, Sarianna 97–98n94, 98n98, 98n99,
99n100, 99n103, 100n109, 101n112
- Metzger, Bruce M. 17n84, 199n1, 201n11,
282n38, 296n101, 297n105, 300n120,
311–12n3, 313n11, 315n16, 327n72,
328n78, 344n150, 366n261, 417n213
- Meyer, M. 306n145
- Michaelis, Wilhelm 288n67, 291n81, 383n65,
383n67
- Michaels, J. Ramsay 405n168, 426n249,
427n254
- Michel, O. 282n37, 289n71, 291n79, 291n81,
371n9, 372n12, 373n16, 379n43, 406n171,
414n202, 419n218
- Milgrom, Jacob 91n62, 175n164, 366n264

- Milik, J. T. 71n215, 73n229, 95n84, 96n86,
101n115, 109n163, 113n180, 113n182,
113n183, 114n189, 115n195, 116, 117n202,
121n224, 145n5, 147n16, 147n16, 148,
148n21, 149n25, 149n29, 150n34, 151n35,
152n39, 157n69, 158n74, 158n77, 161n99,
163n107, 173n153, 178n179, 180n186,
180n188, 183n206, 184n207, 251n286
- Millar, Fergus 262n327
- Miller, David M. 219n115
- Miller, James C. 12n55
- Milligan, G. 407n173
- Miscall, Peter D. 20n97
- Mitchell, Alan C. 11n46, 14n65, 16n75, 17n83,
27n5, 292n87, 296n102, 302n124,
303n129, 303n130, 304n132, 305n141,
313n11, 316n21, 356n210, 384n71, 386n79,
393n116, 399n145, 403n164, 430n268
- Moberly, R. Walter L. 338n122
- Moffatt, James A. 58n160, 289n72, 291n80,
296n102, 299n117, 302n124, 309n158,
316n21, 327n74, 329n84, 334n107,
341n137, 360n232, 362n243, 371n9,
377n32, 379n45, 383n66, 384n72,
385n77, 390n103, 391n111, 393n119,
399n145, 401n156, 403n164, 404n167,
406n172, 415n207, 425n243
- Moffitt, David M. 1n2, 173n157, 174n161,
203n22, 204n28, 283n44, 286–87,
286n58, 287n60, 287n62, 287n63,
287n64, 289n72, 290n76, 290n77,
291n79, 291n82, 292n87, 294n94,
294n96, 295n97, 298n109, 300n118,
302n124, 304n133, 305n138, 371n7,
386n78, 386n80, 391n109, 412n197,
418n215, 418n217, 419n218, 421n228,
425n243
- Momigliano, A. 60n169
- Montefiore, H. A. 288, 288n65, 289n71,
309n158, 329n82, 350n176, 361n242,
377n32, 393n119
- Moore, Nicholas J. 335n113
- Morgan, Jonathan 221n129, 221n131, 222n134,
223n142
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. 115n194, 127n262,
129n269, 130, 130n278, 153n44, 183n32
- Mosser, Carl 10–11, 11n46, 11n47, 14n64,
14n65, 339n127, 342n143, 358n225,
359n227, 362n247, 364n256, 365n257,
366n262
- Motyer, Steve 15n72, 16–17, 16n76, 16n77,
16n78, 17n81, 89n47, 269n1, 271, 271n8,
315n19, 342n144, 365n259, 410n195
- Moulton, James Hope 186n215, 290n75,
402n157, 407n173
- Mowinckel, Sigmund 293n90
- Muddiman, John 191n241
- Mueller, James R. 226n159, 227n164
- Mulder, Otto 31n6, 37n41, 38n45, 38n46,
38n47, 40n50, 40–41n54, 41n57, 42n66
- Müller, P. -G. 304–5n137
- Muntingh, L. M. 341n135
- Muraoka, T. 188n224
- Murphy, Frederick James 208n51, 209n59,
209n61, 210n66, 211n74, 212, 212n80,
212n82, 214, 214n91, 216n102, 217–18n110,
218n111, 232n187, 232n188, 232n190,
233n191, 233n193, 234n200, 235n205,
236n207, 237n215, 238n218, 238n220,
239n226, 240n228, 240n230, 241n232
- Murray, Oswyn 44n78, 45n82, 46, 46n92,
46n94, 48n103, 48n105, 50n115
- Myers, J. M. 200n8, 203n17
- Nairne, A. 403n164
- Najman, Hindy 64n189, 295n100
- Nauck, W. 11n49, 12n52, 369n2
- Nebe, G. Wilhelm 86n39
- Neusner, Jacob 266n348, 266n349
- Newsom, Carol A. 6n21, 52n126, 102n117,
112n171, 117n202, 117n203, 124n240,
125n248, 127, 127n262, 127n263, 127n264,
128n265, 128n268, 129, 129n269,
129n270, 129n271, 129–30n272, 130n273,
131n280, 131n281, 131n282, 131n283,
131n284, 132, 132n285, 132n286, 132n287,
132n288, 132n290, 133n294, 134,
134n297, 134n299, 134n300, 134n301,
134–35n304, 135–36, 135n306, 135n307,
135n311, 136n312, 136n315, 137, 137n317,
137n319, 138, 138n323, 138n324, 138n325,
139n329, 139n331, 139n332, 139n333,
140n339, 140n341, 140n343, 141n346,
141n348, 149n29, 149n30, 149n31, 154n52
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 29n1, 44n77,
45n84, 45n86, 46n91, 55n141, 55n142,

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (cont.)
 55n144, 55n145, 56n148, 59n164, 60n165,
 61n170, 64n189, 71n214, 71n215, 71n216,
 71n218, 76n249, 97n94, 104n133,
 108n156, 109n160, 111n167, 112n172,
 127n264, 128n268, 134n297, 145n14,
 145n6, 145n7, 146n8, 146n10, 147n15,
 147n16, 149n25, 149n29, 149n31, 150n33,
 150n34, 151n35, 151n37, 152n39, 152n40,
 152n42, 153, 153n44, 153n46, 154n47,
 155n53, 156n63, 158n73, 158n74, 158n75,
 158n76, 158n77, 159n79, 159n80, 159n82,
 159n83, 159n84, 159n85, 160n93, 160n95,
 161n97, 161n100, 161n101, 162n102,
 162n104, 163, 163n105, 163n106, 163n107,
 163n108, 163n110, 165n114, 165n115,
 165n117, 165n119, 165n120, 165n121,
 165n122, 166n123, 166n124, 167n126,
 167n129, 168n130, 168n131, 169n135,
 169n137, 170n138, 170n140, 171n142,
 171n145, 171n146, 176n171, 177n175,
 183n206, 190n235, 191n241, 191n242,
 192–93, 192n244, 192n248, 193n251,
 193n254, 200n5, 206n42, 212n81,
 217n110, 218n111, 219n116, 220n123,
 221n131, 232n187, 232n188, 233n191,
 239n222, 239n223, 241n233, 254n299,
 254n301, 264n338, 264n340
- Nida, Eugene A. 187n218, 351n184, 408n185,
 409n187
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin 60n167, 60n168,
 61n170, 62n180, 242n237, 242n239,
 242n244, 243n247, 244n252
- Ninow, Friedbert 9n37
- Nir, Rivka 208n51, 208n53, 212n81, 212n86,
 213n89
- Nitzan, Bilhah 81n10, 102n119, 112n172,
 112n177, 113n182, 113n183, 115n195,
 116n200, 116n201, 117n202, 117n205,
 117n206, 118, 118n208, 118n209, 118n211,
 119–20, 119n212, 119n213, 119n214, 119n215,
 119n216, 119n217, 120n218, 120n221,
 121n224, 122n229, 124n239, 124n241,
 124n243, 126, 126n257, 128n265, 129n271,
 130, 130n279, 132n287, 132n290, 142n350
- Noack, Bent 242n239, 243n247
- Nolland, John 62n180, 79n3, 288n66,
 308n156
- Nomoto, Shinya 9n41, 58n160
- O'Neill, J. C. 244n252
- O'Brien, Peter T. 11n46, 13n57, 13n62, 15n72,
 16n75, 17n83, 87n41, 271, 271n11, 275n1,
 277n9, 280n24, 283n41, 284n45, 284n49,
 286n54, 286n59, 288n68, 289n72,
 292n87, 295n97, 299n117, 302n128,
 303n129, 304n133, 304n136, 305n141,
 309n158, 311n2, 314n16, 315n17, 315n21,
 316n21, 316n23, 316n24, 319n32, 320n38,
 327n72, 327n73, 327n74, 328n76,
 328n77, 329n81, 329n84, 333n100,
 333n103, 333n104, 333n106, 335n114,
 335n116, 337n118, 338n121, 339n128,
 341n135, 341n136, 342n139, 342n144,
 343n148, 345n153, 345n154, 347n164,
 347n166, 348n171, 349n172, 350n182,
 351n184, 351n186, 357n214, 358n225,
 359n227, 361n242, 362n243, 362n244,
 362n247, 365n258, 365n259, 366n262,
 370n3, 371n9, 377n32, 378n36, 379n43,
 383n68, 384n71, 386n78, 386n79,
 387n88, 389n95, 390n105, 390n108,
 391n112, 392n114, 393n119, 394n124,
 397n133, 399n143, 399n145, 400n150,
 401n156, 404n165, 404n167, 412n196,
 414n202, 415n207, 418n216, 419n218,
 422n228, 424n236, 424n238, 424n240,
 425n243, 427n254, 428n260, 429n261,
 429n265, 430n273, 431n275
- O'Connor, M. 85n30, 98n99
- Oberholtzer, Thomas K. 327n75, 329n83
- Oegema, Gerbern S. 164n112
- Oepke, A. 375n28
- Oesterley, W. O. E. 30n5, 39n48, 40n54, 42n64
- Olson, Daniel C. 148n21, 149n25, 151n35,
 151n38, 152n39, 152n40, 158n74, 158n76,
 159n79, 159n80, 159n83, 160n88, 160n92,
 160n94, 161n101, 162n102, 163n107,
 165n119, 167n127, 168n129, 168n131,
 170n140
- Olyan, Saul M. 30n3
- Orlov, Andrei A. 70–71, 71n214, 71n215,
 71n218, 72n224, 73n229, 73n230,
 73–74n231, 74n232, 74n234, 75n237,
 75n238, 115n192, 222n137, 226n158,
 227n166, 228n171, 229n173, 230n179,
 230n180, 250n282, 251n283, 251n286,
 287n61
- Osborne, Grant O. 316n25

- Osty, Emile 57n153
 Oswalt, John 152n41, 321n39
 Otzen, Benedikt 6–7, 7n23, 147n19
 Owen, John 290n76
- Parry, Donald W. 6n22, 34n24, 84n25, 101n109, 106n144, 140n339, 175n162, 330n90
 Patai, Raphael 6n19, 80n8, 330n90
 Pate, C. Marvin 333n106
 Pattemore, Stephen W. 21n105
 Patton, Corinne 95n80
 Pearson, Birger A. 71n214
 Peeler, Amy L. B. 87n42, 204n23, 287n60, 300n19, 421n228
 Pelletier, A. 48n103
 Penner, Ken M. 219n115
 Pennington, A. 226n163
 Perdue, Leo G. 31n7, 31n12, 33n19, 34n25, 37n39
 Perkins, Larry J. 307n147
 Perrot, Charles 236n208, 237n215, 238n218, 239n226, 240n227, 240n230, 240n231
 Petersen, Anders Klostergaard 64n189
 Petersen, David L. 398n138
 Peterson, David G. 9n41, 17n83, 299n113, 299n116, 301n23, 302n124, 304n132, 305n142, 307, 307n149, 307n150, 307n152, 308n153, 308n154, 308n155, 309n158, 316n22, 345n154, 345n155, 346n157, 350n177, 362n243, 372n12, 380n48, 380n49, 383n68, 384n71, 392n116, 400n150, 402n156, 418n217, 419n218, 429n265, 430n271
 Pfann, Stephen J. 84n25, 103n121, 106n144
 Picard, J.-C. 219n115, 220n123, 221n128
 Pietersma, Albert 376n29
 Poirier, John 229n175
 Porter, Paul A. 158n75
 Porter, Stanley E. 15n70, 15n71, 271n10, 271n12, 272n15, 283n43, 300n121, 302, 302n125, 302n126
 Priest, John F. 121n224, 191n242, 192n244, 192n246, 192n248, 194n257, 194n259, 196n264
 Prinsloo, W. S. 320n36, 320n38, 322n47
 Propp, William H. C. 8n29, 8n36, 9n37
 Puech, Émile 71n218, 75n242, 82, 82n16, 83n19, 83n21, 84–85n26, 86n39, 92n64, 95n79, 95n82, 96n86, 97n91, 109n163, 128n268, 177n179
- Quinn, Russell D. 301n23
- Rahlf, A. 22n109, 40n52, 277n12, 305n139
 Rajak, Tessa 45n86, 263n330
 Rappaport, Uriel 45, 45n87, 45n88, 46n91
 Ravid, Liora 175n164, 175n166
 Reed, Annette Yoshiko 76n244, 146n9, 149n31
 Reese, James M. 55n147
 Reid, Patrick V. 331n93
 Reider, Joseph 407n176
 Reimer, A. M. 124n238, 124n241
 Rengstorf, K. H. 390n103
 Reymond, Eric D. 136n314
 Reynolds, Noel B. 84n25, 101n109, 106n144, 140n339
 Rhee, Victor (Sung-Yul) 338n122
 Rhoads, David M. 191n241
 Rice, George E. 391n109
 Richardson, Christopher A. 1n2, 37n39, 314n13, 327n72, 332n96, 337n118, 338n121, 338n123, 343n145
 Rickenbacher, Otto 31n8, 31n12
 Ringgren, Helmer 79n3, 104n135, 113n185
 Rissi, Mathias 16n75, 283n42, 343n148, 346n155, 381n54, 384n72, 387n88, 390n103, 402–3, 402n157, 402n161, 425n245
 Robertson, A. T. 402n157
 Robinson, Edward 406n173
 Roddy, Nicolae 208n53
 Rogers, Jessie 35n26, 35n27
 Rooke, D. W. 276n3, 398n138
 Rose, Wolter H. 397n136
 Roth, Cecil 87n43
 Rothschild, Clare K. 12n55, 13n59, 358n225
 Rowland, Christopher 60n166, 114–15n192, 123, 123n235, 138n325, 144n1, 151n37, 154n51, 154n52, 155n53, 157n70, 185n211, 230n180, 230n182, 251n285, 284n51
 Rubinkiewicz, R. 226n157, 226n159, 226n160, 226n161, 226n162
 Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van 34n24, 35n27, 172n148, 172n152, 173n156, 175n164, 175n165, 175n166, 176n168, 176n169
 Runia, David T. 65n192
 Russell, Brian D. 8n29, 8n30

- Sabourin, Leopold 335n13, 402n57
 Sacchi, Paolo 72n223, 72n224, 146n9, 149n25, 150n32, 164n13
 Salevao, Iutesone 13n62, 17n83, 364n255
 Sanders, E. P. 64n187, 195n263, 201n11
 Sanders, Jack T. 31n7, 274n1
 Sayler, Gwendolyn B. 208n54, 209n59, 209n61, 217n109
 Schäfer, Peter 132n284, 154n48, 195n262, 229n178
 Schaff, Philip 12n56
 Schenck, Kenneth L. 11n46, 16n75, 55n145, 64n190, 65n192, 68n200, 283n42, 284n49, 289n72, 290n73, 291n82, 292n86, 292n87, 294–95, 295n97, 298n109, 298n110, 329n83, 335n112, 337, 337n119, 339n128, 339n130, 355n207, 371–72n11, 372n12, 373n16, 390n107, 391n110, 400n148, 406n172, 409n188, 412, 412n197, 414n203, 415n207, 415n208, 419, 419n219, 422n230, 429n263, 429n265
 Schenk, Wolfgang 377n32
 Schierse, Franz-Josef 289n71, 292n87, 360–61, 360n231, 360n232, 361n235, 360n236
 Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1n2, 79n3, 84n26, 85n30, 90n51, 91n62, 93, 93n68, 103n124, 104, 104n127, 104n130, 104n131, 105n140, 113n182, 113n183, 113n185, 115n195, 123n236, 142n349, 258n316, 258n317, 260n323, 364n256
 Schippers, R. 309n159
 Schlier, Heinrich 407n173
 Schmidt, Francis 90n53
 Schofield, Alison 98, 98n96, 98n97, 99n104, 101n109
 Scholem, Gershom G. 144n1, 229n174
 Scholer, John M. 58n160, 289n68, 305n142, 308n153, 308n154, 308n155, 310n160, 329n84, 343n148, 345n152, 345n154, 345n155, 346n156, 346n157, 349n172, 350n181, 352n188, 378n36, 380n48, 380n49, 380n52, 380n53, 387n88, 389n95, 390n108, 391n112, 394n124, 402n157, 402n160
 Schreiber, Stefan 193n254, 193n255
 Schreiner, Johannes 31n1, 31n12, 304n133
 Schuller, E. M. 112n177
 Schultz, Joseph P. 295n100
 Schürer, Emil 262n327
 Schwartz, Daniel R. 85n30, 195n263, 196n264
 Schwartz, Seth 254n299, 255n304, 256n307, 263n334
 Schwemer, Anna Maria 8n28, 93n71, 128n267, 130n278, 138n324
 Scott, James M. 171n142, 172n149, 172n151, 172n152, 173n156, 174n160, 176n168, 176n169
 Segal, Alan F. 19n90
 Segal, Michael 175n164
 Selwyn, Edward Gordon 426n250
 Seesengood, Robert P. 12n55
 She, King L. 402n157, 424n241
 Shea, William H. 402n157
 Shemesh, Aharon 86n35, 171n145
 Sheppard, Gerald T. 33n18, 33n19, 33n20, 33n21, 34n23, 35n27, 35n29
 Short, Charles 174n159
 Shutt, R. J. H. 44n77, 44n78, 45n84, 46n91, 47n95, 53n131, 54n138
 Silva, Moises 309n159
 Simon, Marcel 60n169, 62n180, 64n186, 242n244, 243n247, 244n248, 244n249, 249n280
 Simpson, E. K. 389n95
 Skehan, Patrick W. 30n1, 30n3, 30n4, 31n6, 31n7, 31n8, 31n11, 31n12, 32n16, 33n18, 34n23, 34n26, 36n37, 37n40, 37n44, 40n54, 41n57, 41n58, 41n61, 42n64, 42n66, 83n21
 Skelton, David A. 37n42, 41n61
 Slingerland, H. Dixon 176n172, 177n179, 183n201
 Smend, R. 31n11, 39n48, 40n52
 Smillie, Gene R. 351n184, 352n191, 352n193
 Smith, Jerome 283n41
 Smith, Ralph L. 147n19, 353n199, 354n202, 398n138
 Snaith, John G. 31n12, 39n48
 Sommer, Benjamin D. 20n96, 20n98, 21, 21n101, 21n102, 21n103
 Son, Kiwoong 312n9, 315n19, 333n106, 335n112, 343n148, 344n151, 347n162, 347n163, 347n166, 348n171, 351n185, 409n188, 420n224
 Sowers, Sidney G. 57n156, 65n192, 400n150, 427n253
 Sparks, H. F. D. 199n1, 201n10

- Spatafora, Andrea 92n63, 92n66
 Sperber, Alexander 314n15
 Spicq, Ceslas 11n49, 16n76, 17n83, 28on24, 283n41, 289n72, 291n80, 291n81, 301n123, 313n11, 315n17, 316n21, 329n82, 334n107, 340n134, 341n137, 347n164, 350n176, 361n242, 371n9, 377n32, 383n66, 384n70, 407n173, 415n207, 417n214, 419n218, 425n243, 431n276
 Spilsbury, Paul 254n302, 258n318, 258n319, 259n320, 261n324, 264n336
 Stanley, Christopher D. 22n107
 Stanley, Steve 11n49, 415n207
 Stegemann, Ekkehard W. 417n212
 Stegemann, W. 417n212
 Stegemann, Hartmut 89n48, 90n53, 91n58, 91n62, 93, 93n69, 96n90, 103n121, 103n122, 104n129, 105n137, 111n169, 113n180, 113n182, 113n183, 115–16, 116n197
 Stelten, Leo F. 174n159
 Stemberger, G. 33on87
 Sterling, Gregory E. 9n39, 65n192, 135n311, 395n129, 408n183, 422n230, 423n231, 429n263, 429n264
 Steudel, Annette 81–82n11, 82, 82n14, 82n15, 82n17, 83n19, 83n21, 84n25, 84n27, 85n29, 86n39, 87n43, 103n122, 279n21, 427n254
 Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan 157n69
 Stone, Michael E. 71n214, 71n218, 144n1, 149n25, 150n34, 152n39, 152n40, 178n179, 180n186, 184n207, 185n211, 190n237, 200n4, 200n5, 200n8, 201n9, 201n10, 201n11, 202n15, 203n17, 203n20, 203n21, 204, 204n24, 204n27, 204n28, 204n29, 204n30, 204–5n32, 205n34, 205n35, 205n36, 205n39, 206n43, 207n47, 211n76, 221n129, 226n161, 226n163, 227, 227n165, 287n61
 Stordalen, T. 35n26, 35n27, 175n162
 Strack, Hermann L. 291n79, 330n87
 Strawn, B. A. 100–101n109
 Strobel, August 36on232
 Strugnell, John 81n11, 82n14, 83n21, 86n39, 108n156, 108n157, 109n160, 109n162, 127n259, 127n264, 128n265, 128n268, 130, 130n272, 130n275, 130n276, 131n284, 138n324, 180n188, 349n174
 Stuart, Douglas K. 8n34, 366n265
 Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 95n80, 103n121, 103n125, 103n126, 109n162, 111n169, 113n184, 114n190, 132n287, 133n293, 148n21, 162n102, 163n107, 163n109, 288n68, 289n69, 292n86, 295n97
 Sukenik, E. 104n132, 106n144, 111n169
 Sullivan, Kevin P. 126n253
 Sutcliffe, Edmund F. 100n106
 Suter, David W. 145n7, 146n8, 149n31, 157n72, 158n76, 159n84, 160n95, 165n114, 169n136, 173n155, 176n170, 177n175, 218n111
 Svendsen, Stefan Nordgaard 1n2
 Swanson, Dwight D. 89n48, 89n49
 Sweet, J. P. M. 191n241, 192n246, 193n252
 Swetnam, James 10n45, 11n46, 11n49, 289n71, 299n117, 300n121, 341n136, 360n230, 413n198
 Synge, F. C. 397n135
 Talmon, Shemaryahu 118n208
 Tate, Marvin E. 293n90, 293n91
 Tcherikover, Victor 44n79, 45n88, 49, 49n111
 Tengström, S. 141n344, 141n345
 Terrien, Samuel 195n262
 Thackeray, Henry St. John 44n77, 257n310
 Thayer, J. H. 406n173
 Theissen, G. 318n28, 318n30
 Thiele, W. 199n1, 201n10
 Thiering, B. E. 90n53, 91n60
 Thistleton, Anthony C. 290n75
 Thomas, K. J. 396n132, 406n172
 Thompson, James W. 1n2, 1n4, 9n41, 10n45, 18n88, 276n8, 287n60, 289n72, 296n103, 301n123, 302n124, 303n129, 304n133, 304n134, 305n141, 310n162, 312n7, 318–19n30, 327n72, 329n83, 333n101, 333n107, 336n117, 337n118, 338n122, 342n144, 343n148, 345n152, 345n154, 346, 346n156, 355, 355n206, 355n207, 356, 358n225, 359n228, 360n231, 361n239, 362n247, 363, 363n250, 363n251, 364n255, 370n3, 371n10, 383n66, 384n71, 386n79, 387n88, 399n145, 402n157, 414n202, 419n218, 422n230, 424n238, 427n254, 429n263, 429n264
 Thyen, Hartwig 11n46
 Tiede, David L. 195n262

- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 95n80, 97n94,
108n156, 109n160, 109n161, 109n162,
109n163, 110n165, 139n333, 146n9, 149n31
- Tiller, Patrick A. 158n74, 158n75, 158n76,
158n78, 159n79, 159n85, 160n87, 160n91,
160n94, 160n95
- Tobin, Thomas H. 429n266
- Tov, Emmanuel 84n25, 106n144
- Traub, Helmut 9n41
- Tromp, Johannes 178n179, 192, 191n241,
191n242, 192n244, 192n245, 192n249,
193n256, 194n257, 194n258, 194n259,
195n262, 195n263, 196n264, 196n265,
197n268
- Trudinger, L. Paul 362n245
- Tucker, Gene M. 152n41
- Turdeanu, Émile 76n246, 226n157
- Turner, Nigel 186n215, 290n75, 402n157,
407n176
- Tzoref, Shani 9n37, 342n141
- Ullman-Margalit, Edna 79n1
- Vaganay, L. 11n49, 11n50, 11n51
- Vaillant, A. 71n218
- VanderKam, James C. 16n79, 30n2, 73n231,
75n243, 76n245, 82n16, 90n53, 91n60,
94n78, 115n193, 142n349, 145n6, 145n7,
146n12, 147n14, 147n15, 147n16, 147n17,
147n18, 150n33, 151n35, 151n38, 152n39,
154n50, 158n74, 158n76, 159n79,
159n80, 159n81, 160n90, 161n100,
161n101, 162n102, 162n103, 162n104,
163n107, 165n114, 165n117, 165n119,
165n121, 166n123, 166n124, 167n127,
167–68n129, 168n130, 168n131, 169n135,
169n136, 169n137, 170n138, 170n140,
171n142, 171n144, 171n145, 171n147,
173n153, 174n160, 175n164, 176n169,
180n187, 181n191, 194n257, 233n194,
376n30
- Vanhoye, Albert 11n49, 11n51, 276n9, 292n85,
292n87, 294n94, 294n96, 305n142,
309n159, 319n31, 357, 357n216, 358n225,
402n157
- Vattioni, Francesco 39n48
- Vermes, Geza 64n189, 71n218, 201n11,
226n160, 226n161, 226n163, 227n164,
262n327
- Vermeylen, Jacques 6n22
- Vincent, R. P. H. 51n122
- Vogel, Manuel 233n191, 236n208
- von Rad, G. 322n46, 332n95
- Vorster, Willem S. 20n92
- Wace, Henry 12n56
- Wacholder, B. Z. 89n48, 91n60, 92, 92n64,
92n65, 94n74, 96n87
- Walker, Peter W. L. 11n46, 14n65, 14n69,
15n72, 16n76, 16n80, 17n81, 17n83,
89n47, 269n1, 271, 271n8, 333n102,
356n212, 359n227, 359n228, 362n243,
365n257, 365n259, 365n260, 387n89,
401n155, 413n200, 414n203
- Wallace, Daniel B. 15n70, 15n73, 272n14,
280n24, 284n46, 284n48, 290n74,
300n121, 327n73, 329n84, 333n104,
335n113
- Wallace, David 280n25
- Waltke, Bruce K. 85n30, 98n99, 147n19,
228n170
- Walton, J. H. 6n19, 6n22, 80n8, 330n90,
331n93, 334n111
- Wardle, Timothy 62n179, 80n5, 91n62,
104n131, 112n175, 115n195, 129n268,
146n8, 158n77, 159n84, 160n90, 161n96,
163n108, 172n148, 177n175, 177n177,
178n179, 183n202, 200n7, 203n22,
210n72, 212n86
- Wassen, Cecilia 80n4, 104n128
- Wasserstein, Abraham 44n79, 46n89, 46n91
- Wasserstein, David 44n79, 46n89, 46n91
- Watts, John D. W. 8n29, 8n33
- Weber, Robertus 199n1, 201n10
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. 358n224
- Weinfeld, Moshe 34n24, 42n65, 122n230,
230n180, 330n90
- Weiser, Artur 293n91, 320n37, 322n46,
322n47
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich 11n46, 282n37,
283n41, 283n42, 287n60, 291n84,
292n87, 327n72, 327n74, 359n228,
406n171, 429n263
- Weiss, Herold 323n58, 334n107
- Weitzman, Steven 229n174
- Wendland, Paul 44n81
- Wenham, Gordon J. 34n24, 112n174, 175n162,
330n90, 376n30

- Wenthe, Dean O. 104n134, 105n137, 105n138
- Wentling, Judith L. 91n58, 91n60, 94n77
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 98n99, 99n100, 99n102, 100n106, 100n107, 100n109, 101n113, 101n115
- Westcott, B. F. 271n7, 289n71, 291n84, 297n107, 299n117, 303n128, 303n129, 309n158, 327n74, 329n82, 347n163, 361n241, 371n9, 380n48, 384n70, 385n75, 390n103, 392n115, 402n157, 410n193, 417n214, 420n224
- Westfall, Cynthia Long 11n49, 12n54, 312n4, 312n6, 312n8, 395n128, 397n134
- Wevers, John William 286n57, 294n96, 297n107, 305n139, 329n80, 402n158, 406n171
- Wheeler-Robinson, H. 152n42
- White, L. Michael 45n86, 46n89, 46n91
- Whitters, Mark F. 209n59
- Wikgren, Allen 305n142, 309n158
- Wildberger, Hans 152n41, 153n43, 379n46
- Willett, Tom W. 200n5, 204n27, 211n76
- Willey, Patricia Tull 20, 20n97
- Williams, Clarence R. 358n225
- Williamson, Ronald 9n39, 9n41, 57n156, 65n192, 65n193, 68n200, 315n21, 318–19n30, 338n122, 340n134, 348n171, 349n172, 361n239, 377n32, 406n171, 422n229, 429n265, 430n273
- Wills, Lawrence M. 11n46, 91n59
- Wilson, Andrew M. 91n59
- Wilson, E. Jan 84n25, 101n109, 106n144, 140n339
- Wilson, James P. 362n245
- Wilson, R. McL. 297n107, 309n158, 346n155, 359n228, 377n32, 384n69, 393n119, 399n145, 403n164, 429n265, 430n271, 431n274
- Windisch, Hans 281n31, 289n71
- Winston, David 55n141, 55n142, 56n148, 59n163
- Wintermute, O. S. 115n193, 171n142, 171n147, 176n169
- Wise, Michael O. 84n25, 84n26, 84n27, 85n29, 85n30, 86n37, 89n48, 90n53, 91n59, 91n62, 92n63, 92n66, 93n72, 94, 94n75, 94n76, 96n86, 96n87, 97n92
- Wold, Benjamin G. 108n156
- Wolff, Hans Walter 353n199, 354n202, 354n203
- Wolfson, Elliot R. 130n272, 133n294
- Wolfson, Harry Austin 67n199
- Woollcombe, K. J. 426n248
- Worrell, John 100n106
- Wray, J. H. 318n30, 321n39, 334n107
- Wright, Addison G. 55n147, 56n148
- Wright, Benjamin G. 111 29n1, 30n3, 32n15, 34n23, 36n37, 40n54, 41n59, 44n76, 44n77, 44n79, 45n82, 45n83, 45n84, 45n86, 46n89, 46n91, 47n95, 48n100, 48n102, 48n103, 49n106, 49n109, 49n110, 50n112, 50n114, 50n115, 50n116, 50n117, 51n118, 52, 53–54, 53n129, 53n131, 54n133, 54n135, 54n137, 54n138, 146n8
- Wright, J. Edward 155n59, 156n61, 186, 184n207, 184n208, 186n215, 208n51, 218n112, 220n119, 221n129, 222n138, 223n142, 224n145, 224n147, 224n148
- Wright, N. T. 16n79, 36n34, 37n39, 168n134, 262n328, 272n18, 287n60, 382n60
- Yadin, Yigael 81n10, 84n27, 85n28, 85n29, 85n30, 86n39, 89n48, 89n49, 89n50, 90n53, 91n61, 92n63, 92n64, 93n70, 96n88, 96n90, 105n138, 106n144, 106n146, 107n151, 107n152, 127n264
- Yonge, C. D. 400n150
- Young, Norman H. 299n117, 359n227, 362n243, 362n245, 363n251, 364n253, 364n255, 384n71, 384n74, 385n75, 385n77, 386n79, 389n93, 391n109, 414n202, 414n204, 415n207, 415n209, 416n212, 418n217, 419n219, 420n222, 420n225, 420–21n226
- Zahn, Molly 89n48, 89n49
- Zeitlin, Solomon 53n132, 191n242, 193n250
- Zenger, Erich 288n68, 293n90, 293n91, 320n35, 320n36, 322n48
- Zerwick, Maximilian 424n239
- Ziegler, Joseph 36n36, 40n52, 407n176
- Zimmer, Robert G. 19n90
- Zsengellér, József 32n16, 35n26, 35n29
- Zuntz, G. 296n101, 300n120, 417n213

Index of Ancient Literature

Old Testament

Genesis

1	33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42	15:5	210n69
1-Exod 24	171	15:5-6	231
1:1-2:3	38n47, 330-31, 336	15:9-10	227
1:2	33	15:10	227
1:6-8	33n19	15:13	253
1:26	298n108	17:1	112n174, 120n219,
1:26-30	42	17:5	376n30
2	35	18:2	280n26
2-3	175	19:1	74n236
2:1-2	43	19:1-28	74n236
2:1-3	3, 34, 43n74, 330-31,	19:2	211n74
	33n93	22	187n218
2:1-4	43	22:1	228
2:2	7, 204, 317, 319n33, 324,	22:2	228, 228n171, 367n267
	328-33, 328n79,	22:11	228
	329n80, 330n87,	22:13	228, 367n267
	330n88, 332n95,	22:16-17	388, 389n93
	334n108, 335	23:4	339-40
2:2-3	325	24:23	187n218
2:3	43, 324	24:25	187n218
2:6	33, 33n19, 237, 237n215	24:40	112n174, 376n30
2:8 (LXX)	75n240	25:27	120n220
2:10 (LXX)	75, 75n240	26:10	188n223
2:10-13	237n215	27:12	347n160
2:11	239n225	27:15	38n45
2:11-12	34n25, 240	27:19	288n67
2:15-25	175	27:21	347n160
2:16	34	27:22	347n160
3	35n28	28	252n291, 253n298
3:8	112n174, 376n30	28:10-17	151
4:4	288n67	28:13-29	94
4:10	35n184	28:14	94
5:22	112n174, 150n33, 376n30	28:17	190n235
5:24	112n174, 150n33,	28:22	154n49
	354n204, 376n30	31:54	141n344
6:1-4	145-46, 149, 149n25	35:1-15	94
6:9	112n174, 120n219,	36:11	239n222
	376n30	36:15	239n222
6:14	39n48	36:42	239n222
8:20	367n267	43:33	288n67
9:16	151n38	48:13	279n23
15	226	48:15	112n174
15:1-7	227	48:18	288n67
		49:1	278n16
		49:3	288n67

49:15	321n39	19:18	353n196
49:33	324n59	19:21	155n57
Exodus		19:21–22	186n213
3:8	304n133	19:22	155n57
4:22	110, 110n164, 288, 289n69	20:2	196n266, 316n25
4:22–23	288n67	20:11	324, 325
5:5	324n59	20:18	344n151
6:2–6	316n25	20:26	50, 176
6:6–8	304n133	22:28	47n96, 288n67
7:1	233n194, 312n7	23:12	324n60
7:4–5	304n133	23:15	366n265
10:21	346, 346n156	23:19	47n96, 154n49
12	171n142, 174	23:20	105n142, 304n133
12:48	380n48	23:21	284n51
13:2	288n67	23:23	304n133
13:3	196n266, 316n25	24:2	155n57, 186n213
13:5	304n133	24:3–8	387n86
13:11	304n133	24:4	171n142
13:14	196n266, 316n25	24:6	48n101, 422n229
13:16	357n218	24:8	422, 422n229
13:21	33	24:9–18	151, 228
14	171n142	24:10	156
15	9n37	24:10–17	155n54
15:1–18	9n37	24:16–18	304n136
15:12–17	8n29	24:17	355n205
15:13	187	24:18–25:40	403n164
15:13–17	167	25	69, 138
15:17	7–9, 7–8n28, 8n36, 9n37, 34n23, 57, 57n155, 58, 75, 78, 81, 83n22, 84n25, 85n29, 90, 91, 93, 93n70, 160n86, 181, 197, 234n195, 278, 304n133, 323, 331, 342, 404n165	25–30	35, 172n149
15:17–18	82, 84, 93, 173, 181, 278	25–40	68
15:18	57n155, 181	25:1	331n91
16:9	380n48, 380n49	25:2	47n96, 47n97
16:23	324n60	25:3	47n97
16:30	334n109	25:8	5, 57n155, 68n200, 90, 91, 234, 234n199, 255
16:35	294, 294n96	25:8–9	34n23, 57n155, 210n70, 215–16, 215n100, 234n199, 241
17:7	320n38	25:9	57n153, 58n158, 67, 68n200, 137, 138n327, 172n149, 234, 406n172
18:12	141n344	25:11	39n48
18:13–26	104n127	25:17	379n44
19:11	147	25:18	378n42, 379n44
19:12	347n161	25:19	378n42, 379n44
19:16–19	344n151	25:20	378n42, 379n44
		25:21	379n44
		25:22	378n42, 379n44
		25:22–29 (LXX)	48n100
		25:23 (LXX)	48n105

Exodus (cont.)

25:23-24	48n105	29:26	307n147
25:23-30	48, 48n100	29:27	307n147
25:31-34	48n101	29:28	141n344
25:40	6n21, 57n153, 58n158, 67, 68n200, 137-38, 138n327, 172n149, 188n70, 215-16, 215n100, 234, 234n199, 235n202, 395, 404-5, 406n171, 406n172, 426, 426n248	29:29	307n146
		29:30	188n225, 398n141
		29:31	307n147
		29:33	307n146
		29:34	307n147
		29:35	307n146
		29:36	282n40
		30:6	39n48, 379n44
		30:7-8	175n167
26:1	137n318	30:10	188n224, 282n40
26:1-37	34n23	30:11	331n91
26:30	57n153, 235n202	30:15	188n224
26:31	39n48	30:16	188n224
26:33	39n48, 390n106	30:17	331n91
26:33-34	187n219	30:20	188n225
26:33-37	137n316	30:22	331n91
26:34	379n44	30:23	35n29
26:35	39n48	30:23-28	35, 35n29
26:36	136n315, 137n318	30:24 (LXX)	42n63
27:3	48n102, 224	30:26	402n158
27:8	235n202	30:34	35n29, 331n91
27:16	136n315	30:34-38	175n167
27:21	39n48	31:1	331n91
28	53-54	31:1-17	331
28:2	37n44	31:7	379n44
28:4	53n130, 53n131	31:12	331n91
28:15-21	239	31:15	324n60, 324n60
28:27 (LXX)	53n131	31:17	324, 325, 331
28:31	53n131	31:18	43n74
28:35	185n210, 188n225	32:9-14	211n74
28:39	136n315	32:19	236n207
28:39-40	53n130	32:29	307n152
28:40	37n44	33:2	105n142
28:41	308n152	33:3	304n133
28:42	176	33:7	403-4n164
28:43	185n210, 188n225, 380n50	33:7-8	363n248
		33:14	324, 324n61
29	307	33:38	35
29:4	387n85	34:15	141n344, 141n345
29:5	53n130	34:20	288n67, 366n265
29:6	114n189	34:21	324, 325
29:8	53n130	34:26	154n49
29:9	307, 307n146	34:32	380n49
29:14	363n248	35:2	321n40, 324n60, 325
29:21	386n83	35:5	47n96, 47n97
29:22	307n147	35:12	39n48, 379n44

35:19	188n225	3:6	141n344, 367n267
36:1	398n141	3:6-16	367n267
36:6	47n96, 47n97	3:9	141n344, 367n267
36:8	398n141	3:11	367n267
36:33	188n225	3:14	367n267
36:35	39n48	3:16	367n267
36:35-38	137n316	4:3	269, 377n32
36:37	136n315	4:5	307n146
37:2	39n48	4:6	39n48
37:6	379n44	4:10	141n344, 367n267
37:7	378n42, 379n44	4:12	363n248
37:8	378n42, 379n44	4:17	39n48, 386n83
37:9	378n42, 379n44	4:19	367n267
37:10-16	48n100	4:21	363n248
38:3	223	4:26	141n344, 367n267
38:5-6 (LXX)	379n44	4:31	141n344, 367n267
38:8 (LXX)	379n44	4:35	141n344
38:9-11 (LXX)	48n100	5:9	386n83
38:18	136n315	5:15	398n141
38:23	48n102	5:18	188n223
38:27	39n48, 188n225	5:24	395n130
39:1	47n96, 47n97, 398n141	6:4	363n248
39:11	188n225	6:20	386n82
39:12	188n225	7-8	307
39:27	53n130	7:2-4 (LXX)	366n263
39:29	136n315	7:11	141n344
39:30	114n189	7:11-15	366, 366n262, 366n264
39:32	43n74	7:12	141n344
39:34	39n48, 137n316	7:12-15 (LXX)	366n263
39:35	379n44	7:13	141n344
39:43	43n74, 331	7:15	141n344
40	235n202	7:16	141n344
40:3	39n48	7:17	141n344
40:12	387n85	7:18	141n344
40:14	53n130	7:20	141n344
40:16	235n202	7:21	141n344
40:20	379n44	7:29	141n344
40:21	39n48, 137n316	7:32	141n344
40:22	39n48	7:34	141n344
40:26	39n48	7:37	141n344, 307n147
40:34-35	234n199	8:6	387n85
40:34-38	33, 222n134	8:7	53n130
		8:9	114n189
		8:11	386n83
		8:13	53n130
		8:15-19	387n86
		8:17	363n248
		8:22	307n147
		8:26	307n147
Leviticus			
1:4	188n224		
2:12	47n96		
3:1	141n344		
3:3	141n344		
3:5	367n267		

Leviticus (cont.)		16:15	39n48, 379n44, 386n83, 390n106
8:28	307n147	16:16	402
8:29	307n147	16:17	380n51
8:31	307n147	16:19	386n83
8:33	307n146, 307n147	16:20	402
9:5	155n58, 380n48, 380n49	16:23	380n51
9:7	155n58, 380n48, 380n49	16:24	387n85
9:8	155n58, 380n48, 380n49	16:26	387n85
9:11	363n248	16:27	361, 363n248, 423
9:18	141n344	16:28	387n85
10:3	186n213	16:30	282n40
10:4	155n58, 363n248, 398n141	16:31	324n60
10:5	53n130, 363n248	16:32	307n146
10:14	141n344	16:33	90n55, 402, 413n199
11:40	387n85	17:3	363n248
12:1-5	175	17:5	141n344
12:4	90n55	17:15	387n85
13:46	363n248, 393n118	17:16	387n85
14:3	363n248	18:3	304n133
14:8	387n85	18:22	380n49
14:9	387n85	19:5	141n344
14:16	386n83	19:6	141n344, 141n345
14:27	386n83	19:30	90n55, 398n141
14:41	39n48	20:3	90n55, 398n141
14:32	282n40	20:22	304n133
15:5	387n85	21:10	307n146, 308n154
15:6	387n85	21:12	90n55, 398n141
15:7	387n85	21:17	155n58, 380n49
15:8	387n85	21:18	155n58, 380n49
15:10	387n85	21:21	155n57, 155n58, 186n213, 380n49
15:11	387n85	21:23	39n48, 90n55, 155n57, 155n58, 380n49
15:13	282n40, 387n85	223	380n49
15:16	387n85	22:6	387n85
15:18	175, 387n85	22:12	47n96
15:21	387n85	22:14	188n223
15:22	387n85	22:21	141n344
15:27	387n85	22:29	141n344
16	188n224, 362n243, 402	23:3	324n60, 334n111
16:2	39n48, 379n44, 380n51, 390n106	23:10	47n96
16:4	53n130, 387n85	23:19	141n344
16:12	39n48, 390n106	23:24	324n60
16:13	379n44	23:32	334n109
16:14	379n44, 386n83	23:37	141n344
		23:39	324n60
		24:3	39n48

24:14	363n248	6:24–27	113n182, 134n299
24:23	363n248	7:13	48n102
25:4	324n60	7:17	141n344
25:10	342n139	7:19	48n102
26:1 (LXX)	243n246	7:23	141n344
26:2	90n55, 398n141	7:25	48n102
26:11	234n199	7:29	141n344
26:12	112n174	7:31	48n102
26:13	304n133	7:35	141n344
26:30 (LXX)	243n246	7:37	48n102
26:31	90n55, 398n141	7:41	141n344
26:34–35	334n109	7:43	48n102
26:42	94	7:47	141n344
26:45 (LXX)	316n25	7:49	48n102
27:25	398n141	7:53	141n344
27:26	288n67	7:55	48n102
		7:59	141n344
Numbers		7:61	48n102
1:50	188n225	7:65	141n344
3:3	307n146	7:67	48n102
3:6	188n225	7:71	141n344
3:8	304n133	7:73	48n102
3:12–13	288n67	7:77	141n344
3:16	304n133	7:79	48n102
3:31	188n225	7:83	141n344
3:32	398n141	7:84	48n102
3:38	90n55	7:85	48n102
4:2	395n130	7:88	141n344, 307n152
4:3	188n225	7:89	378n42, 379n44
4:5	39n48, 137n316	8:4	235n202
4:9	188n225	8:16–18	288n67
4:12	188n225, 398n141	8:19	398n141
4:14	48n102, 188n225	8:22	185n210, 188n225
4:15	398n141	8:26	188n225
4:23	188n225	10:10	141n344
4:24	188n225	10:21	90n55
4:26	188n225	10:33	321n39
4:30	188n225	10:33–36	331n94
4:35	188n225	10:35	321n40, 325n64
4:37	188n225	12:7	311, 312n7, 313–14,
4:39	188n225		313n11, 313n11
4:41	188n225	12:14	363n248
4:43	188n225	12:15	363n248
5:3	363n248	12:16	305n139
5:4	363n248	13–14	304–5, 326n72
5:7	395n130	13:1	305n139
5:9	47n96	13:2–3	305, 305n139
6:17	141n344	13:3	305
6:18	141n344	13:4	305

Numbers (cont.)

14	305
14:4	305
14:10-25	211n74
14:18	282n40
14:23	322n47
14:30	322n47
15:3	141n344
15:8	141n344
15:18	304n133
15:20	47n96
15:21	47n96
15:36	363n248
16:9	185n210, 188n225
16:19-24	211n74
16:22	165n118
16:39-40	175n167
17:5	155n58, 380n49
18:1	90n55
18:2	188n225
18:3	380n49, 398n141
18:6	185n210, 188n225
18:7	39n48, 188n225
18:8	47n96
18:11	47n96
18:12	47n96
18:20	109n162
18:21	188n225
18:21-24	271n9
18:22	155n58
18:23	188n225
18:28	270
18:29	47n96, 90n55
18:30	47n96
18:32	47n96
19:3	363n248
19:4	386n83
19:7	387n85
19:8	387n85
19:9	363n248
19:19	387n85
19:20	90n55, 398n141
20:13	320n38
24:3-9	234n195
24:5-7	35
24:5-9	403
24:6	36n33, 234n195, 403-4, 403n164, 404n165, 411
24:14	278n16

24:17 247-48

25 320n33

25:2 141n345

25:11 324n59

26:14-39 172n152

29:33 101n113

28:9-10 334n111

31:6 398n141

31:13 363n248

31:19 363n248

31:26 395n130

31:29 47n96

31:49 395n130

32:10-13 322n47

35:28 269n2

Deuteronomy

1:9-18	104n127
1:34-35	322n47
2:7	375
3:20	322n50, 324n61
4:11	155n58, 345, 345n153
4:11-12	344n151
4:17	138n322, 407n176, 409n188
4:18	138n322
4:19	138n322
4:21	322n47
4:24	355n205
4:30	278n16
5:6	196n266, 316n25
5:22	344n151
5:23	155n58
5:27	155n58
5:33	324n61
6:8	357n218
6:10	288-89n68, 304n133
6:12	196n266, 316n25
6:13 (Vulgate)	196n266
6:23	304n133
7:1	304n133
7:8	196n266, 316n25
8:2	304n133
8:7	304n133
8:7-10	34n25
8:14	196n266, 316n25
8:15	304n133
8:16	278n16
9:3	355n205

9:4	304n133	18:13	120n219
9:19	344n151	21:16–17	288n67
9:28	304n133	23:1–3	103n125
10:8	185n210, 188n225	23:2	32n14
11:12	110n164	23:3	32n14, 83, 84
11:18	357n218	23:4	32n14
11:29	304n133	23:9	32n14
12	179n184, 257	23:11	363n248
12:2	281n33	23:12	387n85
12:5	48n104	23:13	363n248
12:5–7	34n23	23:14	104n131
12:6	47n96	23:15 (MT)	104n131, 112n174
12:9	316n25, 321, 321n39, 321n41, 322n54, 323n57, 325–26	25:19	216n105, 321n39, 322n50, 324n61
12:9–10	322n50	26:2	47n96
12:10	216n105, 321n39, 324, 324n61, 325	26:9	304n133
12:11	47n96, 48n104	26:10	47n96
12:11–14	34n23	26:15	113n184, 148
12:13–14	228n171	27:17	354n204
12:14	48n104	28:15–68	172n152
12:15	140n343	28:29	347n160
12:17	47n96	29:4	304n133
12:18	48n104	30:5	304n133
12:21	48n104, 140n343	31–34	193
12:26	48n104	31:11	48n104
12:27	141n344	31:14–23	193–94
13:5	196n266	31:16–29	172n152
13:6 (LXX)	316n25	31:20	304n133
13:10	196n266	31:21	304n133
13:11 (LXX)	316n25	31:23	304n133
14:23–24	48n104	31:29	196n265
15:19	125n245	32	220n123, 286–87, 287n60
15:20	48n104	32:3	282n36
16:1–8	174	32:4	120n219
16:2	48n104	32:8	297n107
16:6	48n104	32:8–9	110n164, 297n107
16:7	48n104	32:12	304n133
16:11	48n104	32:37	220n123
16:15	48n104	32:38	141n344, 141n345
16:16	48n104	32:43	286, 286n59, 287n60, 290, 294, 297n107
17:8	48n104	33	147n18
17:10	48n104	33:2	147n17
17:12	188n225	33:2 (LXX)	295n100
18:3	141n344	33:3	85n27, 131n284
18:4	47n96	33:8	320n38
18:5	185n210, 188n225	33:8–10	185n209
18:6	48n104	33:12	182n197

Deuteronomy (cont.)

34 237
34:1-4 216

Joshua

1:13 324n61, 333n102
1:15 324n61, 333n102
3:3 324n59
4 341n138
4:16 341n138
4:17 341n138
4:18 341n138
5:6 322n47
5:13-15 105n142
6:23 363n248
6:24 154n49
8 235
10:12 247
11:23 324n61, 333n102
15:17 239n222
18:1 158n78
18:9 158n78
18:11-28 182n197
21:44 216n105, 324n61, 333n102
22:4 324n61, 333n102
22:8 138n322
22:13 269, 377n32
22:23 141n344
22:27 141n344
22:33 269
23:1 216n105, 324n61,
333n102
24:8 304n133
24:14 120n219
24:17 196n266
24:27 278n16
24:33 377n32

Judges

1:13 239n222
1:14 382n63
1:24 382n65
1:25 382n65
3:9 239n222
3:11 239n222
4:11 393n118
5 147n18
5:4-5 353n196

6:8 196n266, 316n25
6:18 393n118
9:16 120n219
9:19 120n219
11:8 375
12:5 308n152
16:23 141n344
16:26 347n160
17:5 307n152
17:12 308n152
18:11-30 181n193
18:31 154n49
20:43 (LXX, A) 321n40, 325n64

Ruth

1:9 321n39
2:7 324n59

1 Samuel

1:7 154n49
2 377
2:13 141n344
2:29 141n344
2:30 170n139, 374, 376
2:30-35 112n174, 376
2:34-35 313, 314n13
2:35 170n139, 311, 314n13,
316n21, 374, 376-78,
377n34, 404n165
4:4 378n41
9:13 141n344, 141n345
10:8 141n344
11:15 141n344
16:3 141n344
16:5 141n344
20:6 141n344
20:29 141n344

1 Kingdoms (LXX)

2:11 188n225
2:18 188n225
2:29 47n96
2:30-35 376
3:1 188n225
12:6 313n10
13:9-10 367n267
16:14 382n63
29:6 382n63

2 Samuel

6	194n258, 194n259
6:2	378n41
7	83n21, 89, 87n42, 288–89, 314
7:1	204, 216, 216n105, 321n39
7:5	84
7:6–7	112n174
7:7	376n30
7:10	83, 83n19
7:10–11a	82–83
7:10–13	82
7:11	83, 87, 216, 216n105, 321n39
7:11–14	83, 84,
7:12	83
7:13	83, 239n226, 249n279
7:14	83, 87, 87n42, 278, 278n20, 285, 288n65, 321n39
7:16	162n104
22:3	303–4n131
22:24	120n219
22:26	120n219
22:31	120n219

2 Kingdoms (LXX)

3:25	382n63
6:17	367n267
7:7	376
7:16	313n10
7:25	313n10
13:18	399n147
22:16	292n89
22:26	307n151

1 Kings

1:9	140n343
1:19	140n343
1:25	140n343
2:35	377
3:5–15	56
5:4	204
5:31	236n210
6:2	154n49
6:5	154n49
6:15–16	39n48
6:16	187n219

7:8	39n48
7:9	39n48
7:10–11	236n210
7:31	39n48
7:40	236n212
7:48	48n100
8	33n17, 57n157, 147n19, 258–59, 381n57
8:4–6	194n258
8:13	5n17, 9n37
8:22–23	331
8:27	6, 258
8:30	6n18, 147n13, 151n38
8:32	6n18
8:34	6n18
8:36	6n18
8:37–38	331
8:39	6n18, 8n28, 9n37
8:43	6n18, 8n28, 9n37
8:45	6n18
8:49	6n18, 8n28, 9n37
8:56	167, 321n39, 322n54
8:65	331
9:1	236n212
9:4	120n218
9:7	163n104
14:21	347n165
19:2	52n126
19:15	378n41
22:19	105n142, 190n238, 378n40
22:19–21	152n40

3 Kingdoms (LXX)

1:36	313n10
2:13	382n63
3:4	281n33
3:7	382n63
7:26	48n102
7:31	48n102
7:34	48n100
7:36	48n102
8:6	399n141
8:11	188n225
8:26	313n10
8:30	147n13
8:53	5n17
8:56	321, 321n41, 325
8:63	383n67

3 Kingdoms (LXX) (cont.)

9:9	316n25
10:5	399n147
11:5	281n33
12:31	281n33
12:32	281n33
13:2	281n33
13:32	281n33
13:33	308n152
14:23	281n33
15:14	281n33
19:12	52n126
21:25	354n204
22:44	281n33

2 Kings

5:4	216
6:17	105n142
6:30	39n48
11:4–12	334n111
16:10	138n322
16:17	334n111
19:15	378n41
19:35	105n142
20:3	376n30
21:7	179n184
23:27	179n184
25	259

4 Kingdoms (LXX)

4:43	399n147
6:15	399n147
9:33	386n82
11:6	382n65
19:27	382n63
22:4	269n2
23:11	382n65
24:14–15	48n102
25:14	188n225

1 Chronicles

1:36	239n222
1:53	239n222
4:13	239n222
4:15	239n222
6:16 (LXX)	321n40, 325n64
6:17 (LXX)	188n225
6:31	325n64, 331n94
9:23	154n49

11–19

12:9	393n118
13:6	378n41
15:2	185n210, 188n225
16:1	404n164
16:2	367n267
16:4	188n225
16:27	48n104, 84n24
16:30	357n220
16:37	188n225
17	313–14
17:4	313
17:6	112n174, 376, 376n30
17:10	313
17:12	313, 316n21
17:14	312, 313–14, 313n10, 313n11, 314n13, 316n21, 404n165
17:23	313n10
22:9	321n39
23:13	188n225
23:25	322n52, 324, 324n61, 325
23:28	188n225, 282n40
23:32	188n225
26:12	188n225
28	138
28:2	203n21, 321n39, 331n94
28:8	32n14
28:9–11	89n49
28:11	137, 379n44
28:11–19	405n168
28:12	137
28:17	48n102
28:18	137–38
28:19	137, 405n170
29:2	236n210
29:5	308n152
29:11	282n36, 282n37
29:21	141n344

2 Chronicles

1:9	313n10
2:5 (MT, LXX)	147n14
2:6	147n14
3:1	228n170
3:6	236n210
3:14	39n48

4:8	48n102	23:6	188n225
4:21	48n102	26:8	383n64
5:9	399n141	26:16–20	175n167
5:11	399n141	26:31	334n109
5:14	188n225, 222n134	28:8	32n14
6	33n17, 147n19, 258–59, 381n57	29:11	185n210, 188n225
6:2	5, 9n37	29:21	399n141
6:12–39	331	29:21–32	367n267
6:18	6, 258	29:27	367n267
6:20	15n38	29:27–30	52
6:21	6n18, 147n13	29:29	367n267
6:23	6n18	29:31	308n152
6:25	6n18	29:31–32	367n267
6:27	6n18	29:35	307
6:30	6n18, 8n28, 9n37	30:22	141n344
6:32	48n104	30:27	113n184
6:33	6n18, 8n28, 9n37	31:2	188n225
6:34	179n184	31:5	47n96
6:35	6n18	31:10	47n96
6:38	179n184	31:12	47n96
6:39	6n18, 8n28, 9n37	31:14	47n96
6:40	48n104, 195n263	32:21	105n142
6:41	34, 75, 167, 321, 321n41, 321n42, 322n51, 322n54, 325, 331	32:22	324n61, 325n63
6:41–42	216n105	33:7	179n184
6:41–7:3	204	33:1–10	216
7:1–3	159	33:10–17	216
7:5	141n344, 383n67	33:16	141n344
7:8	331	34:9	269n2
7:20	163n104	35:3	188n225
8:4	188n225	36	259
8:12	367n267	36:17	240n227
8:16	307n151	Ezra	
9:24	399n147	2:68	9n37
11:14	188n225	2:69	53n130
13:9	308n152	3:12	217n108, 260
13:10	188n225	4:46	282n36
14–15	325n63	5:15	210n70
14:5–6	324n61	6:3	210n70
14:6 (MT)	321n39	6:5	210n70
14:7	321n39	6:7	210n70
15:8	383n67	8:25–30	47
15:15	324n61	9–10	146n8
18:2	140n343	10:21	174n159
18:18	32n16	Nehemiah	
20:30	324n61, 325n63	7:1	40n50
21:3	288n67	7:69	53n130
		7:70	48n102

Nehemiah (cont.)

7:71	53n130
9:6	147n14
10:30	146n8
10:38	270
10:40	399n147
12:43	141n344
12:44	40n50
12:45	282n40

1 Esdras (LXX)

1:55	334n109
2:10	48n102
5:39	393n118
5:40	377n32
5:63–65	19n90
7:13	393n118
8:54	393n118
8:66	393n118
9:9	393n118
9:39	377n32
9:40	377n32
9:49	377n32

2 Esdras (LXX)

6:21	393n118
7:24	399n143, 399n147
8:25	47n96
9:1	393n118
17:70	48n102
20:38	47n96
20:39	399n143
20:40	47n96, 399n147
22:44	47n96
23:5	47n96

Esther

2:10	342n139
2:20	342n139
8:6	342n139
9:16–18	321n42
B4 (LXX)	427n254

Job

1:1	120n220
1:7	376n30
1:8	120n220
2:2	376n30
2:3	120n220
4:16	52n126

5:1	131n284, 186n215
5:14	347n160
8:20	120n220
9:20	120n220
9:21	120n220
9:22	120n220
12:4	120n219
12:26	347n160
15:15	131n284, 186n215
16:19	131n283
22:14	112n174, 376n30
26:9	378n40
36:4	120n219
38	33n19
38:9	33n19
38:11	33n19
38:16	33n19

Psalms

1:1	83, 83n21
2	63n184, 87, 87n42, 278, 280–81, 280n27, 288–89
2:1	83n21
2:6	347n165
2:7	87, 87n42, 276, 276n9, 278, 278n20, 280–81, 280n27, 285, 288n65, 290n76, 388, 389n93, 391
8	42n68, 43n71, 204n23, 274, 280, 292n86, 295, 298–99, 302n128, 310
8:1	299
8:1–2	298n108
8:3–7	42
8:3–8	298
8:4–6	275, 296, 299–303
8:5	42n68, 299
8:5–6	298
8:5–7 (LXX, MT)	296, 298–99
8:5–8	42
8:6 (LXX)	3n9, 304
8:7 (LXX)	296n101
8:7–8	298
8:9	298
9:9 (LXX)	292n89
9:11	347n165
11:4	57n153, 331, 378n40, 397

14:2	148n23	45:7-8 (MT)	285
15:2	120n219	45:10 (MT)	279n23
15:8 (LXX)	279n23	46:5	357n220
16:8 (MT)	279n23	46:4-5	341n135
17:3 (LXX)	303n131	46:6	357n219
17:8 (LXX)	357n219	46:9 (LXX)	190n238
17:16 (LXX)	292n89	47:8	190n238, 397
18:2	303n131	47:9 (LXX)	341n135
18:7 (MT)	57n153, 357n219	47:9 (MT)	190n238
18:8 (LXX)	354n201	48:1	347n165
18:20 (MT)	112n171	48:1-2	50n113
18:24 (MT)	120n219	48:2 (LXX)	292n88
18:26 (MT)	120n219	48:8	341n135
18:31 (MT)	120n219	49:12 (LXX)	292n88
19	41	49:14 (LXX)	189n233
19:1	42	49:23 (LXX)	189n233
19:3	41n60	50	320
19:7 (LXX)	186n215	50:2	347n165
20:6	186n215	50:9 (LXX)	386, 386n83, 387
21:23 (LXX)	303	50:14	189n233
22:22	303	50:15 (LXX)	366n265
23:1 (LXX)	292n88	50:23	189n233
24:3	238n221	51:7	386
24:7 (LXX)	188n223	51:15	366n265
24:7	137	51:15-17	102n116, 367n266
24:9	137	51:17	141n344
25:7 (MT)	188n223	53:2	148n23
25:7	188n223	55:17	73n227
25:8 (LXX)	48n104	56:14 (MT)	112n174, 376n30
26:3	112n174, 376n30	62:4 (LXX)	366n265
26:8	234n199	62:6 (LXX)	366n265
31:9 (MT)	112n171	63:3	366n265
32:14 (LXX)	8n28	63:5	366n265
33:14	8n28, 9n37	65:1	347n165
34:10 (MT)	131n284	66:1-3	128n267
37:18	120n219	67:8-9 (LXX)	147n17
39:7-9 (LXX)	428	67:18-19 (LXX)	147n17
40:3 (MT)	112n171	67:34 (LXX)	147n14
40:6-8	428	68:5 (MT)	77n249
41:5 (LXX)	376	68:6 (MT)	113n184
42:4	376	68:7-8	147n17
42:5 (MT)	376n29	68:8-9 (MT)	147n17
42:10	220n123	68:17-18	147n17
44:7-8 (LXX)	285	68:18-19 (MT)	147n17
44:10 (LXX)	279n23	68:33	147n14
45:5 (LXX)	354n204, 357n220	68:34 (MT)	147n14
45:6 (LXX)	357n219	70:23 (LXX)	366n265
45:6-7	285	71:8 (LXX)	292n88
45:7 (MT)	285n54	71:23	366n265

Psalms (cont.)

74:2 347n165
 74:19 203
 75:3 LXX 8n28
 76:2 8n28, 347n165,
 365n259
 76:19 (LXX) 357n219
 77:8 (LXX) 313n10
 77:18 357n219
 77:37 (LXX) 313n10
 78:11 (LXX) 282n36
 78:52-54 304n133
 78:60-71 34n23
 78:67-71 194n258
 78:68 347n165
 78:68-72 249n276
 78:69 50n113, 331
 79:10 220n123
 80:1 203n19, 378n41
 80:8 203n18
 80:8-18 401n152
 80:9 234n197
 80:10 (MT) 234n197
 80:10 234n198
 80:11 (MT) 234n198
 80:14-18 234n196
 81 320
 81:1 (LXX) 31
 81:5 (LXX) 357n219
 82:1 31
 82:5 357n219
 84:7 347n165
 84:12 (MT) 120n219
 86:2 (LXX) 341n135
 86:5 (LXX) 341n135
 87:1 206n45, 341n135
 87:2 347n165
 87:5 341n135
 88:7 (LXX) 31
 88:12 (LXX) 292n88
 88:28 (LXX) 281, 288n67
 89 110n164, 278, 281,
 288n68, 289n69
 89:2 (LXX) 292n88
 89:6 31, 131n284, 288n68,
 349n175
 89:8 131n284
 89:14 9n37
 89:15 (MT) 9n37

89:28 (MT) 278, 281, 288-89,
 288n67, 289n69
 90:7 (LXX) 279n23
 91:7 (MT) 279n23
 92:1 (LXX) 292-93, 357, 357n217
 92:1 (MT) 334n110
 92:4 (LXX) 281n34, 294n94
 92:5 (LXX) 313n10
 92:13-14 34n25
 93 292, 294n94, 357
 93:1 292-94, 357n217
 93:4 281n34, 294n94
 94 (LXX) 332n99
 94:7-11 (LXX) 316
 94:11 (LXX) 320-25, 321n41, 325n67,
 345n152
 95 318, 320, 326n69,
 327n75, 327n76,
 330n88, 332n99,
 337n120, 375
 95 (LXX) 294n94
 95-99 292
 95:1-2 320
 95:1-7 320
 95:2 320
 95:3-5 320
 95:6 320
 95:7 320, 332
 95:7-8 317-18
 95:7-11 316, 320, 343n147
 95:8 330n88
 95:9 330n88
 95:9 (LXX) 357n219
 95:10 320n38
 95:10 (LXX) 293, 357, 357n217
 95:11 204, 316n24, 317-19,
 321-22, 322n46,
 322n54, 323n57, 326,
 328-30, 330n87, 335,
 345n152
 95:13 (LXX) 292n89
 96 294n94, 357, 357n220
 96 (LXX) 287
 96:1 (LXX) 287
 96:1-2 128n267
 96:4 (LXX) 286, 357n219
 96:6 42n69, 84n24
 96:6 (LXX) 286
 96:7-9 128n267

96:9 (LXX)	287		276n8, 276n9, 279n23,
96:9	357n219		292n86, 379, 394–98,
96:10	293–94, 357, 357n217		397n135, 411, 428
96:10–13	293	110:2	275, 282n37, 347n165
97	286–87	110:3	282n37
97:1	287	110:4	3, 4, 4n13, 280n27,
97:2	9n37		282n39, 388, 388n91,
97:4	286, 357n219		389n93, 391, 396–97,
97:5	168n131		396–97n133, 411
97:7	286, 287n60	110:5 (MT)	279n23
97:9	287	112:5 (LXX)	281n34, 294n94
98:1 (LXX)	357n219	113:2 (Vulgate)	174n159
99:1	331n94, 357n219,	113:5–6	394n125
	378n41	113:5	281n34
99:2	347n165	115:2	220n123
99:5	76n257, 203n21	116:9	112n174, 376n30
100:4	86n40	116:17	141n344
101:6	120n218, 120n219	118:171 (LXX)	366n265
101:26–28 (LXX)	285–86, 372	119:1	120n219
102:16	347n165	119:80	120n219
102:21	347n165	119:171	366n265
102:21 (LXX)	399n147	120:8 (LXX)	382n63
102:25–27	285–86, 286n55, 372	122:3	203
103:4 (LXX)	285, 349n144, 399n147	128:5	113n182, 347n165
103:19	378n40	131:5 (LXX)	48n104
103:20–22	128n267	131:14 (LXX)	321, 321n41
103:21	349n175	132:1	322n54
104:4	285	132:7	203n21
104:5	9n37	132:8	34, 321n39, 322n51, 331
106:20	138n322	132:8–11	34n23
106:22 (LXX)	189n233, 367n267	132:13	347n165
106:28	141n344	132:13–14	323n57
106:29 (LXX)	52n126	132:14	34, 320, 321n39, 322n51,
107:22	141n344, 189n233,		322n54, 331
	367n267	133:2 (LXX)	399n141
108:6 (LXX)	279n23	134:3	113n182, 347n165
108:31 (LXX)	279n23	135:21	347n165
109:1 (LXX)	2n8, 22n109, 279,	144:3 (LXX)	282n36
	279n23	144:6 (LXX)	282n36
109:5 (LXX)	279n23	144:12	138n322
109:6 (MT)	279n23	147:4	106n146
109:31 (MT)	279n23	148	128n267
110	4, 275, 280n27, 280–81,	148:1	131n283
	280n29, 284, 287,	148:2	32n16, 349n175
	292n86, 299, 397n135	148:3	41n57
110:1 (MT, EVV)	2, 4, 22n109, 76n247,	148:4	147n14
	140, 164n112, 203n21,	150:2 (LXX)	282n36
	274, 275–86, 275n6,	150:6	128n267

Proverbs

1:21	181n192
2:21	120n219
8	31
8:3	181n192
8:31	292n88
9:2-3	48n101
10:9	120n218
11:5	120n219
11:20	120n219
17:1	141n344, 141n345
18:1	393n118
18:10	282n36
20:7	120n218
23:31	48n102
28:10	120n219
28:18	120n219
29:10	120n220

Ecclesiastes

6:5	324n60
8:10	238n221

Song of Songs

5:18	48n102
6:2	48n102
7:3	48n101

Isaiah

1:10-14	334n111
1:16	387
2:2	50, 154n49, 278n16
2:2-4	160n89, 249, 351n185, 354n199
2:3	64
2:18 (LXX)	243n246
4:5	9n37
5:1-7	203n18, 234n196, 401n152
6	6n21, 152, 152n41, 191n239, 229n178, 253n298
6:1	155, 190n238, 378n40, 397
6:1-3	304n136, 331n94
6:1-4	155n54
6:1-13	152n40
6:3	77, 77n250, 165n118, 166, 189n233

6:4	152n41
6:6	148n19, 152n41
6:13	222n134
8:17	303, 303-4n131
8:18	303, 303-4n131, 347n165
10:11 (LXX)	243n246
10:23	292n89
11:10	321n39, 324n60
12:2	304n131
12:6	347n165
13:5	292n89
13:9	292n89
13:11	292n89
13:13	354n201
14:2	160n89
14:3	321n39
14:7	204
14:14	292n88
14:32	341n135
16:5	379, 379n46
16:12 (LXX)	243n246
18:7	347n165
19:1 (LXX)	243n246
23:12	324n60
23:13	324n60
24:1	292n89
24:18	341n138, 354n201
24:23	347n165
26:1	151n38
26:7	112n171
26:20	336
26:21	146n12
28:12	321n39
28:16	341n135
28:24	57n154
29:13	155n57
29:14	354n204
29:17	354n204
31:7 (LXX)	243n246
32:18	321n39
33:5	281n34
35:3	30n5
37:16	378n41
37:18	292n88
37:28	382n63
38:3	112n174, 376n30
38:9	124n238
40:3-5	168

40:15	235n205	66:22-23	93
40:22	404n164	66:19-20	160n89
40:26	106n146		
42:5	404n164	Jeremiah	
42:15	404n164	2:2	307n148
43:28	399n141	2:21	401n152
44:13	138n322	3:16	160n94
44:28	341n135	3:17	351n185
45:1	249n279	4:24	354n201
45:1-8	263n333	7	320
45:8	386n83	7:1	154n49
46:6 (LXX)	243n246	7:1-15	163n104
49:16	211	7:11	154n49
49:20-22	209n65	7:12-14	84n24
49:25	209n65	7:16	155n58
50:1	209n65	7:21	141n344
51:18	209n65	8:7	382n63
51:20	209n65	8:16	354n201
52:1	204n25, 238n221	9:10	89n47
53	73n231	10:10	354n201
54:1	209n65	10:12	292n88
54:10-11	100n106	10:22	89n47
54:11	206n45, 341n135	11:10	196n265
54:11-12	204n25	12:11	89n47
57:15	281n34, 331n94	14:21	190n238
57:18	102n116	16:21	32n16
57:19 (MT)	102n116	17:12	190n238
58:12	341n135	17:26	141n344
59:10	347n160	18:16	89n47
60:1-2	110n164	19:8	89n47
60:1-22	354n199	20:1-6	263n333
60:7	202n16	22:10	342n139
60:10-22	204n25	23:1-4	203n19
60:13	34n25, 238n221	23:5	83n20
60:13-14	202n16	23:20	278n16
60:14	347n165	25:9	89n47
60:19	304n136	25:11	89n47
61:6	185n210, 399n143,	25:12	89n47
	399n147	25:19 (LXX)	278n16
63:15	106n145, 148n23	25:30	113n184
64:4	240n228	25:30-31	146n12
64:10	347n165	26	320
65:17-18	93	26:16 (LXX)	342n139
66:1	76n247, 154n49,	26:19 (LXX)	89n47
	203n21, 321, 321n39,	27:3 (LXX)	89n47
	321n41, 322n567,	27:13 (LXX)	89n47
	325-26, 325n68, 331,	27:23 (LXX)	89n47
	332n95, 378n40	28:15 (LXX)	292n88
66:18-24	92n63	28:26 (LXX)	89n47

Jeremiah (cont.)

28:29 (LXX)	89n47
28:37 (LXX)	89n47
28:41 (LXX)	89n47
28:51 (LXX)	399n141
28:62 (LXX)	89n47
30:24 (MT)	278n16
31:6	351
31:13	351
31:31-34	395, 410-11, 414
31:33-34	428
31:38	351
33:15	83n20
33:17-22	30n3
33:21	399n143
34:13	196n266
36:32	208
37:24 (LXX)	278n16
38:31-34 (LXX)	395, 410
39:3-4	259n320
41:13 (LXX)	316n25
45:3	321n39
49:21	354n201
49:39 (MT)	278n16
50:12	209n65
50:15	41n54
50:46	354n201
52:18	48n102, 188n225
65:17-18	93
66:22-3	93

Lamentations

1:10	32n14
2:1	203n21
2:6	334n111
4:12	292n88

Ezekiel

1	139, 153n44, 229n178, 230n180
1-2	152, 152n40
1:1	200, 200n3
1:1-3:15	152n40
1:13	112n174, 376n30
1:15-21	76n248, 155
1:26	190n238, 378n40, 397
1:26-28	42, 138n324, 155n54, 230
1:28	41, 42n63, 230, 304n136

3:13	76n248
5:5	195n262
5:11	91n56, 399n141
7:4	139n330
7:7 (LXX)	139n330
7:15	39n48
7:15-17	397
7:24	91n56
8-10	153, 211
8:3	138n322
8:6	91n56
8:10	138n322, 407n176, 409n188
9:3	378n41
9:3-8	144n1
9:6	91n56
10	139, 140
10:1	378n40
10:1-20	378n41
10:1-22	155, 304n136
10:4	378n40
10:6-10	76n248
10:8	138n322
10:18	144n1
10:18-19	216
11:6	91n56
11:22	76n248, 378n41
14:14	139n330
14:20	139n330
15:1-5	401n152
16:20-21	209n65
16:36	209n65
17:1-21	234n196, 401n152
19:10-15	401n152
20:31	47n96
20:40	47n96
21:7	91n56, 399n141
22:8	334n111
22:26	139n330, 334n111
23:15	342n139
23:38	91n56, 398n141
23:39	91n56
24:21	91n56, 398n141
25:3	91n56, 398n141
26:10	354n201
26:15	354n201
27:3	383n64
27:11	307n151
28	157

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 28:11-14 | 156n66 | 44:5 | 91n57, 383n64 |
| 28:11-19 | 175n162 | 44:7 | 91n57 |
| 28:14 | 112n174, 376n30 | 44:8 | 91n57, 399n141 |
| 28:15 | 120n219 | 44:9 | 91n57, 399n141 |
| 28:18 | 91n56 | 44:10-14 | 139n330 |
| 31:1-9 | 234n196 | 44:11 | 91n57, 188n225, |
| 31:16 | 354n201 | | 399n141 |
| 34 | 203n19 | 44:12 | 188n225 |
| 36:25 | 139n330, 386n83 | 44:13 | 155n57, 399n141 |
| 36:25-36 | 387 | 44:15 | 91n57, 188n225 |
| 37-48 | 91 | 44:16 | 91n57, 155n58, 188n225, |
| 37:24-28 | 160n89 | | 380n48, 380n49, |
| 37:26 | 91n57, 139n330, | | 399n141 |
| | 399n141 | 44:17 | 188n225 |
| 37:26-28 | 94n77 | 44:19 | 188n225 |
| 37:27 | 7n27 | 44:27 | 188n225 |
| 37:28 | 91n57, 174n159, 399n141 | 44:29 | 188n223 |
| 38:12 | 195n262, 248n273 | 44:30 | 47n96 |
| 38:20 | 354n201 | 45:3 | 91n57 |
| 39:17 | 141n344, 141n345 | 45:4 | 91n57, 155n57, 188n225 |
| 39:19 | 141n344, 141n345 | 45:5 | 188n225 |
| 40-44 | 152n40 | 45:16 | 47n96 |
| 40-48 | 7, 95, 95n83, 96n89, | 45:17 | 334n111 |
| | 129, 144, 144n1, 160n89, | 45:18 | 91n57 |
| | 204n25, 248n273, | 46:4-5 | 334n111 |
| | 348n168 | 46:8 | 137 |
| 40:2 | 202n16 | 46:14 | 188n225 |
| 40:2-3 | 7n27 | 46:19 | 393n118 |
| 40:5 | 202n16 | 46:20 | 188n223 |
| 40:7-8 | 137 | 47 | 51, 155 |
| 40:16 | 34n25 | 47:1 | 7n27, 51n120 |
| 40:22 | 34n25 | 47:1-12 | 35n26, 167 |
| 40:26 | 34n25 | 47:12 | 7n27, 91n57, 399n141 |
| 40:39 | 188n223 | 48:8 | 91n57 |
| 40:46 | 155n57, 185n210, | 48:10 | 91n57, 399n141 |
| | 186n213, 188n225 | 48:21 | 91n57, 399n141 |
| 40:47-48 | 154n49 | 48:20-22 | 73n229 |
| 41:18-25 | 34n25 | 48:30-34 | 7n27 |
| 42:13 | 155n57, 186n213, | | |
| | 188n223 | Daniel | |
| 42:14 | 188n225 | 1:2 | 154n49 |
| 42:15 | 407 | 2:11 | 147n13 |
| 43:1-4 | 155n54 | 2:20 | 282n36, 282n37 |
| 43:4 | 7n27 | 2:28 | 278n16 |
| 43:19 | 155n57, 188n225 | 2:29 | 278n16 |
| 43:21 | 91n57 | 2:34-35 | 207n49 |
| 43:26 | 308n152 | 3:36-40 | 252n292 |
| 44:1 | 91n57 | 3:52-58 (LXX) | 128n267 |
| 44:2 | 376 | 4:15 (MT) | 131n284 |
| 44:3 | 137 | 4:17 | 131n284 |

- Daniel (cont.)
- 4:22 282n36
- 4:36 282n36
- 5:4 (LXX) 243n246
- 5:23 (LXX) 243n246
- 6:10 73n227
- 6:28 (LXX) 243n246
- 7:1 395n130
- 7:3–27 252n292
- 7:7–8 201
- 7:9 165n118
- 7:9–10 155n55
- 7:13 164, 301n123
- 7:21 186n215
- 7:23–25 201
- 7:25 248, 247n265
- 8:11 9n37
- 8:13 399n141
- 9:20–27 161n98
- 10 106n142
- 10:13 105n142, 189n232,
252n292, 297n107
- 10:14 278n16
- 10:20 189n232, 252n292,
297n107
- 10:20–21 105n142
- 11:20 278n16
- 12:7 247n265
- Hosea
- 3:5 278n16
- 4:1–3 101n13
- 4:5 209n65
- 5:10 354n204
- 6:6 366n265, 367n266,
379n45
- 8:13 141n344, 366n265
- 10:1–2 401n152
- 14:2 366
- 14:3 (LXX) 102n116, 189n233, 366
- 14:4–9 34n25
- 14:17 203n18
- Joel
- 1:9 188n225
- 1:13 188n225
- 2:7 220n123
- 2:10 354n201
- 2:11 32n16
- 2:17 188n225
- 2:28 (LXX) 278n16
- 3:1 (MT) 278n16
- 3:18 155n55
- 4:16 347n165, 354n201
- 4:17 347n165, 376
- 4:21 347n165
- Amos
- 1:2 148n19, 347n165
- 7:13 154n49, 174n159
- 9:11 83, 87
- Micah
- 1:2 147–48, 148n19
- 1:2–7 168n133
- 1:3 147, 147n15, 148n19,
151n38
- 1:3–4 146n12
- 1:4 168n131
- 1:6 114n188
- 2:5 32n14
- 2:10 321n39, 324n60
- 3:12 154n49
- 4:1 278n16
- 4:1–2 50
- 4:1–4 160n89, 249, 351n85,
354n199
- 4:2 64
- 4:7 347n165
- 6:4 196n266, 316n25
- 7:10 220n123
- Nahum
- 1:5 354n201
- Habakkuk
- 2:3–4 336
- 2:4 300n121
- 2:20 52n126
- 3 147n18
- 3:1 124n238
- 3:3 147n17
- Zephaniah
- 1:7 141n345
- Haggai
- 1:1 269n2
- 1:8 154n49, 353n198,
- 1:15–2:9 353–54

2:1-3	19n90	2:5	107n150
2:1-9	354n204	2:5-7	107
2:2	269n2	2:11	399n141
2:3	51, 260, 353	3:2	382n63
2:6	214, 214n92, 214n94, 293, 293n93, 352, 355, 358, 372	New Testament	
2:6-9	47, 353-54, 354n203	Matthew	
2:8	353n199	3:9	243n245
2:9	182n199	3:17	290n76
2:21	353n197	4:8	281n32
2:22	354n204	5:13	76n247
Zechariah		5:25	362n245
2:10	347n165	5:34	378n40
2:10-12	204n25	9:13	379n45
2:13	52n126	10:12	341n137
2:17 (LXX, MT)	52n126, 113n184	11:3	329n84
3:1	269n2	11:25-30	30n5
3:8	83n20	12:4	154n49
4:10 (LXX)	51n19, 256n307	12:7	379n45
6	397-98, 398n138	13:2	15n74
6:9-15	397-98	13:54	342n139
6:11	377, 377n32, 398	13:57	342n139
6:11-13	377n33	15:19	222n136
6:12	83n20, 289n69	17:1	281n32
6:12-13	249n279	17:4	340n132
6:13	139n328, 397-98, 397n135, 398n137, 404n165, 411	17:11	329n84
6:15	398n138	19:6	393n118
8:3	202n16, 347n165	21:13	154n49
8:20-23	249	21:16	299, 299n112
8:22	351n185	22:43-45	284n52
8:23	160n89	22:44	4n12, 276n5
9:1	321n39	23:22	378n40
9:9	347n165	23:23	379n45
9:15	48n102	24:15	195n263
12:12	101n113	24:29	357n219
14:5	131n284	26:61	249n279
14:8	155n55	26:64	4n12, 276n5, 282n37
14:9-11	348n168	27:33	362n247
14:14	47	27:49	342n140
14:16	64, 354n199	27:50	213n89
14:20	48n102	27:51	179n182
Malachi		Mark	
1:6-2:9	19n90	1:11	290n76
2:4-7	185n209	1:44	282n40
2:4-9	30n3	2:26	154n49
		3:14	313n10
		6:1	342n139
		6:4	342n139

Mark (cont.)

7:2	342n140
7:4	386n81
8:38	186n215, 291
9:2	281n32
9:5	340n132
10:9	393n118
11:7	154n49
12:35-37	284n52
12:36	4n12, 276n5, 423n231
13:25	357n219
14:58	207n49, 249n279
14:62	4n12, 140n338, 276n5, 277n13, 282n37
15:22	362n247
15:38	213n89
16:19	4n12, 276n5

Luke

1-2	185
1:9	186n214
1:11	186n214
1:19	186n214
1:26-37	186n214
1:32	288n65
1:32-33	288n65
1:50	379n45
1:54	379n45
1:58	379n45
1:69-71	288n65
1:72	379n45
1:78	379n45
2	288n65
2:1	288n65
2:7	288, 288n65, 288n66
2:13	288n65
2:13-14	288
2:22	282n40, 290n76
2:35	373
2:43	306, 308
4:23-24	342n139
5:14	282n40
5:15	373n18
6:4	154n49
9:12	187n218
9:26	186n215, 291n83
9:33	340n132
10:37	379n45
11:51	154n49

12:50	362n245
13:8	362n245
13:32	308
15:18	372n13
15:21	372n13
16:9	340n132
16:11	400n149
16:15	281n32
19:7	187n218
19:46	154n49
20:41-44	284n52
20:42	4n12, 423n231
20:42-43	276n5
20:43	76n247
21:26	357n219
22:16	362n245
22:69	4n12, 276n5
23:33	362n247
23:35	15n74
24:4	74n236
24:15	423n231
24:21	185n212
24:39	347n160

John

1:9	400n149
1:26	15n73
1:35	15n74
2:6	282n40
2:16	154n49
2:19	249n279
3:25	282n40
3:28	423n231
4:4	373
4:20	195n263
4:23	400n149
4:37	400n149
4:44	342n139, 423n231
5:11	300n121
5:13	300n121
5:27	301n123
5:46	272n15
6:32	400n149
6:39	278n16
6:40	278n16
6:44	278n16
6:54	278n16
7:27-39	51
7:28	400n149

8:14	329n84	7:53	295n100
8:16	400n149	7:55	275n5
9	364n255	8:40–9:1	300n121
9:18	362n245	9:13	131n284
9:22	17n84	9:32	373n18
11:24	278n16	9:37	387n84
11:48	195n263	10:9	73n227
12:42	17n84	11:29	300n121
13:10	387n84	13:14–16	17
12:48	278n16	13:15	10n46
13:15	408n178	13:17	281n32
14:3	329n84	13:24	382n62, 382n63
15:1	400n149, 401n152	14:17	328n79
15:1–8	234n196	15:16	340n132
16:42	17n84	16:19	389n98
17:3	400n149	16:33	387n84
17:11	284n52	17:24	426n247
18:5	15n74	17:27	347n160
19:20	362n247	17:30	188n223
19:35	400n149	18:1	393n118
20:11	15n74	18:2	393n118
		19:4	342n140
Acts		20:25	374
1:4	393n118	22:8	395n130
1:6	253n296	21:28	195n263
1:10	74n236	24:15	423n231
1:19	342n140	26:6	15n73
2:15	73n227	26:22	15n73
2:17	278n16	26:23	289n69
2:32–36	284n52	27:20	389n98
2:34	4n12		
2:34–35	276n5	Romans	
2:35	76n247	1:4	284n52
3:1	73n227	3:23	299n113
3:15	305n137	5:2	304n136
3:17	188n223	5:4–5	389n98
5:31	275n5, 305n137	5:14	428n258
6:13	17n84	6:17	428n258
6:13–14	195n263	7:18	342n140
7	364n255	8:17	304n136
7:33	15n73	8:20	299n113
7:38	295n100	8:24	389n100
7:43–44	340n132	8:27	131n284
7:44	426n247	8:29	288n67, 289n69
7:47	154n49	8:34	4n12, 276n5
7:48	207n149, 258n318,	8:35	393n118
	426n247	8:38	375n28
7:49	76n247, 154n49, 325,	8:39	393n118
	378n40	9:7–8	384n72

Romans (cont.)

9:8	342n140
9:23	57n154, 379n45
10:6	342n140
10:7	342n140, 384n72
10:9	284n52
11:20	15n73, 281n32
11:29	4n13
11:31	379n45
12:1	188n227
12:1-2	305n142
12:12	389n98
12:16	281n32
13:6	399n144
15:9	379n45
15:13	389n98
15:14	423n231
15:16	399n144

1 Corinthians

2:6	305n142
3:22	375n28
7:10	393n118
7:11	393n118
7:15	393n118
7:26	375n28
7:37	15n73
9:10	389n98
9:13	181n192
10:6	428n258
12:3	284n52
14:20	305n142, 308
15:24	290n75
15:24-28	290n75
15:25	4n12, 275n5
15:25-27	299n112
15:27	290n75, 297n105, 299n114, 301n123
15:28	290n75
15:43	304n136
15:50	329n84

2 Corinthians

1:7	389n98
5:1-4	420n224
10:1	423n231
12:1-4	184n208
12:2	75n240
12:4	75n240

Galatians

1:4	375n28
3:7	364n255
3:19	295n100
4:25-26	209n65
4:26	204n25, 348n171

Ephesians

1:3-14	346n155
1:20	4n12, 276n5
1:20-22	299n113, 299n114, 299n115
1:21	189n231
1:22	301n123
2:4	379n45
2:6	140n338, 277n13
2:10	57n154
2:22	7n28
4:13	305n142
4:18	188n223

Philippians

2:6	284n51
2:6-11	284n52, 299n113
2:25	399n144
3:12	305n142
3:15	305n142
3:17	428n258
3:21	299n113, 299n114, 301n123, 304n136

Colossians

1:5	389n100
1:15	288n67
1:16	189n231
1:18	288n67, 289n69
1:27	304n136, 389n99
2:16-17	428n261
2:17	409, 409n187, 430n273
2:21	347n161
3:1	4n12, 276n5
3:1-4	140n338, 277n13
3:4	304n136
4:3	13n57
4:12	305n142

1 Thessalonians

1:7	428n258
1:9	382n61, 400n149

2:1	382n62, 382n63	1:3	3, 4n12, 9, 18, 22n109,
2:19	389n99		55n146, 76n247,
5:25–26	13n57, 359n226		140n338, 164n112,
2 Thessalonians			275–85, 276n5, 277n10,
2:2	375n28		279n23, 282n35,
3:9	428n258		283n41, 286, 292n86,
1 Timothy			309n160, 332, 335,
1:1	389n99		358n222, 393n120,
4:12	428n258	1:3–6	395–96, 395n131,
5:10	131n284	1:4	397–98
2 Timothy			314
2:19	15n73	1:4–13	2n6, 3n11, 286, 298n110,
3:1	278n16	1:4–14	417n214
3:14	313n10	1:5	115n194
Titus			284n50
2:7	428n258		87, 276–77, 276n9, 278,
2:13	389n100	1:5–6	280, 280n27, 285,
3:5	379n45	1:5–13	288n68, 289–91,
Philemon		1:5–14	289n70, 298n110, 388
12	342n140	1:6	292
15	393n118		275
Hebrews			274–75, 285–86
1	2, 3n11, 274, 280n26,		5, 21, 250, 275, 277, 278,
	285n53, 287–88,	1:7	278n19, 281, 285–95,
	288n68, 289n69,	1:7–8	287n60, 288n65,
	292n86, 293n90,	1:8	289n72, 290n75,
	296n104, 298n110, 299,	1:8–9	291n79, 294n96,
	302n128	1:9	297n107, 316n25, 332,
1–2	142, 273, 274, 299–302,	1:10	336, 350, 387, 398
	312n6	1:10–12	285, 399n144
1–12	358	1:11	419n220
1:1	3n11	1:12	139, 277, 284n51,
1:1–2	379	1:13	378n37, 396n132
1:1–3	88, 276n8, 333, 387, 415		285
1:1–4	2, 13, 14n65, 191, 274,		277
	277–85, 285n53, 299		277, 284n51, 372
1:1–4:13	369, 431		286, 372, 372n12
1:1–10:18	11n50,		410n195
1:2	2, 87, 280, 281, 285, 288,		4n12, 22n109, 164n112,
	293n91, 296n104,		275–77, 276n5, 276n9,
	356n210, 377, 396n132,		277n12, 279n23,
	398, 400, 423n232, 434		288n68
1:2–3	395–96		295, 299
			3, 274, 292n86, 295, 310
			352
			343n146
			11n50, 274, 275, 295–99,
			352, 352n191
			337, 374

Hebrews (cont.)

- 2:3 295–96, 301n123, 304,
375n25, 414n202
- 2:4 299
- 2:5 5, 13n57, 30n5, 250, 290,
291n79, 292–94,
292n86, 294n96, 295,
297, 297n107, 299, 332,
333n106, 336, 348, 357,
368, 398
- 2:5–8 298n110
- 2:5–9 115n194, 275, 274,
297n107, 299–300,
356n212
- 2:5–10 3n10, 274, 298n109, 315
- 2:5–18 3n11, 295–310
- 2:6 21, 164n112, 296,
296n101, 298n109,
300n119
- 2:6–8 299n112
- 2:8 300–301, 300n120,
300n121, 338
- 2:8–9 300–301
- 2:9 277n9, 277n10, 283, 291,
296–97, 298n109,
300–303, 300n121,
301n122, 304, 310n162,
338, 374
- 2:9–10 299
- 2:10 3, 3n11, 5, 295, 297, 300,
304, 305n137, 306,
306n144, 309n158,
310n162, 315n21,
316n25, 327, 332,
335–36
- 2:10–11 303–4
- 2:10–13 303–10
- 2:10–18 274, 275
- 2:11 303, 328n77
- 2:11–12 3n11
- 2:12 21, 350
- 2:13 3n11, 289n70,
303–4n131, 375
- 2:14 342n140, 384n73,
418n217, 420n223
- 2:14–18 297
- 2:15–16 316n25
- 2:16 18, 295, 299
- 2:17 269n2, 283, 309, 370n3,
376–77, 377n34, 379,
397n133
- 2:17–18 311, 311n1
- 2:17–3:1 3
- 2:18 328n77
- 3 320, 336n117, 337n120
- 3–4 3, 77, 273, 287, 295, 305,
310, 319, 318n28, 319n31,
320n33, 325–26,
326n69, 334n108,
337n120, 345n152,
364n255, 368, 375,
380n53
- 3:1 269n2, 301n122, 314,
315n17, 330, 343n146,
348n170, 370n3,
397n133, 409n189
- 3:1–6 88n46, 269n1, 311–16,
311n3, 312n7, 314n13,
316n25, 376–77,
377n34, 404n165
- 3:1–4:13 273
- 3:2 312, 312n6, 313
- 3:3 312n6, 315n21, 396n13
- 3:3–4 315n21
- 3:4 312n6, 315–16n21, 340
- 3:5 312, 312n6, 313, 313n11
- 3:6 312n6, 314, 315n19,
315n21, 317, 330,
343n146, 390n101,
390n104, 396n132
- 3:7 21, 316
- 3:7–11 317, 330n88
- 3:7–19 328n76
- 3:7–4:11 316–36, 333n103, 342,
344, 370
- 3:8 317
- 3:9 396n132
- 3:10 396n132
- 3:11 320, 326n69, 345n152
- 3:12 316, 317, 332n98,
343n146, 343n147
- 3:12–19 326
- 3:13 330n88, 343n146
- 3:14 311–12n3, 317, 330,
343n146
- 3:15 317

3:16-18	326		377n32, 377n34,
3:16-19	326n72		380n52, 394n123,
3:18	318, 320, 339n127,		397n133, 398, 404n165,
	342n143, 345n152		421
3:18-19	326	4:14-16	3, 4, 11, 11n50,, 225n154,
3:19	317, 326, 332n98,		345n154, 369-81,
	345n152		370n3, 370n5, 381n55
4	254, 334n108, 336n117	4:14-7:28	280n27, 394, 396-97
4:1	317, 317n27, 318, 328,	4:14-10:18	273, 368
	332n97, 337n120,	4:14-10:25	369, 431
	343n146, 345n152	4:15	269n2, 361n239, 370,
4:1-2	326-27, 332, 337n120		377n32, 378, 378n35,
4:1-11	317, 328n76, 348, 390,		393n119, 397n133
	391n112	4:15-16	378
4:2	396n132	4:16	12, 139, 155n58,
4:3	317-19, 320, 328-29,		343n146, 344, 345n154,
	328n77, 328n79,		363, 370, 378, 381,
	330n88, 336, 345n152		381n53, 382n58,
4:3-4	335		382n59, 393n119
4:3-5	317, 328-32	5-10	370
4:4	3, 204, 315n21, 318, 324,	5:1	269n2, 419n220
	330n88, 335n113	5:1-3	3, 388n90
4:5	317n27, 318, 320, 329,	5:1-10	3, 283, 388
	345n152, 396n132	5:1-7:26	388
4:6	317n27, 318, 332,	5:1-7:28	394n127
	332n98, 345n152	5:1-10:18	12, 283, 369, 370n3
4:6-11	317, 332-35, 332n98	5:3	396n132
4:7	289n70, 318, 323n58,	5:4	396n132
	330n88, 332	5:5	87, 269n2, 278, 280n27,
4:8	301n122, 318, 330n88,		397n133
	335n113, 339n127,	5:6	4n13, 388, 388n91,
	340n131		397n133
4:8-10	332	5:7	416n212
4:9	319, 319n32, 334n107,	5:7-10	388
	335, 336, 350	5:9	305-6, 306n144,
4:9-10	333		328n77, 400
4:10	315n21, 318, 328n77,	5:10	4n13, 269n2, 388n91,
	330n88, 334n107, 335,		397n133
	335n113, 345n152	5:11	13n57, 388, 392
4:11	316, 317n27, 318, 330,	5:11-6:12	388
	332n98, 335, 343n146,	5:11-6:20	3, 4, 11n50, 388
	345n152, 352, 387,	5:12	289n70
	407n173, 408n178,	5:14	305n142, 306
	408n183	6:1	289n70, 305n142, 306,
4:12	318		343n146
4:14	10n42, 269n1, 269n2,	6:2	400
	343n146, 370-78,	6:3	396n132
	370n3, 371n7, 372n11,	6:4	315n17, 348n170,
	373n16, 373n18, 375n25,		409n189

Hebrews (cont.)

6:5	291n79	7:11-28	191
6:6	18, 289n70	7:12	354n204
6:7	374n23	7:13	269n1
6:9	2n6, 13n57	7:14	18, 383n66
6:10	131n284, 374n23, 383n66	7:15	4n13, 388n91, 397n133
6:11	13n57, 390n101, 390n104, 420n223	7:16	396n132
6:12	328n77, 337n120, 388, 390n104	7:17	4n13, 388n91, 396n132, 397n133
6:13	351n184	7:18-19	310, 416n210
6:13-14	388, 389n93	7:19	2n6, 4, 155n57, 305-6, 306n144, 345n154, 390n101, 390n104, 415n207, 420n223, 430n270
6:13-15	388	7:20	269n1, 271, 375, 375n25
6:14	396n132	7:20-21	389n93
6:15	337n120	7:21	4n13, 397n133
6:16	388, 396n132	7:22	2n6, 30n5, 301n122, 390n104, 396n132, 421
6:17	337n120	7:23	269n1, 271, 375, 375n25
6:17-18	388	7:25	75n238, 155n58, 328n77, 344, 370, 370n5, 371n7, 380n47, 380n53, 382n59, 419n220
6:18	328n77, 343n146, 390, 390n101, 390n102, 420n223, 430n267	7:26	10n42, 269n2, 281n32, 372, 373n17, 392, 393n122, 394n124, 397n133, 398, 417n214, 421
6:18-20	388-91	7:26-28	3, 391-94, 397
6:19	39n48, 137, 345n152, 361n239, 385n77, 387, 389-90	7:27	269n2, 309n160, 367n267, 392, 397n133
6:19-20	5, 10n42, 269n1, 345n154, 348, 372n11, 380n53, 389n93	7:27-28	388n90
6:20	4n13, 269n2, 345n152, 388n91, 388, 389n93, 389n95, 397n133, 417n214	7:28	269n2, 280n27, 305-6, 306n144, 334n93, 392, 397n133
7	3, 4, 270, 397n133	7:28-8:2	309n159
7:1	351n184	8	4, 394-95, 395n128, 409n188, 428
7:1-3	22	8-10	185, 351
7:1-10	71n214	8:1	4, 4n12, 12n54, 18, 139-40, 140n338, 164n112, 269n2, 275, 276n5, 282n35, 361n239, 370, 372, 372n12, 378, 397, 397n133, 397-98, 397n135, 404n165
7:1-25	391		
7:1-28	388, 394		
7:2	365n259		
7:3	4n13		
7:4	343n146		
7:5	269n1, 270, 375, 375n25, 384n73		
7:6	337n120, 396n132		
7:7	2n6		
7:10	396n132		
7:11	4n13, 306, 388n91, 396n132, 397n133		
7:11-19	4		

- 8:1-2 10, 36n35, 58, 136,
139n328, 294, 372n11,
377n33, 394, 394n127,
395-404, 404n165, 410,
417n214, 426
- 8:1-5 88, 272n18
- 8:1-6 269n1
- 8:1-13 272n13, 394-411
- 8:1-9:23 428
- 8:1-9:28 426, 428
- 8:1-10:18 273, 388, 391
- 8:2 2n7, 36, 36n33, 57n153,
58-59, 88, 114n190,
136n313, 160n86,
185n210, 190n238,
207n49, 250, 315n21,
336, 341, 340n132, 348,
378, 382n61, 396n132,
398, 399n144, 399n147,
400-404, 400n149,
400n150, 402n157,
402n161, 404n164,
404n165, 409, 414,
416n211, 420-21,
420n224, 423, 423n235,
426n247
- 8:3 269n2, 397n133
- 8:3-4 272, 404
- 8:3-5 17n82, 269n1, 272, 394,
404-5
- 8:3-10:18 394, 394n127
- 8:4 272, 272n18, 396n132,
397n133
- 8:4-5 394
- 8:4-6 404
- 8:5 1-2, 4, 5n15, 27, 57n153,
58-59, 68n200, 68n201,
70, 70n211, 137-38,
218n111, 234, 256n307,
272n13, 272n18, 315n17,
340n132, 348n170,
356n211, 374n23, 394,
394n126, 400, 401n155,
403n162, 404-11,
406n171, 406n173,
408n183, 409n187,
409n190, 410n193, 412,
414-15, 414n202,
414n206, 420n224, 421,
- 424, 424n240, 426-27,
429n261, 430, 434
- 8:5-6 425
- 8:6 2n6, 337n120, 346, 410,
414n202
- 8:7 272n15, 412
- 8:7-13 395, 411, 421
- 8:8 315n19
- 8:8-12 88-89n47
- 8:9 356n211
- 8:11 269n1, 396n132
- 8:12 396n132
- 8:13 17n81, 18, 88-89n47,
356n211, 356n212, 414,
416n210, 432
- 9 410, 411, 416n212
- 9-10 283, 402-3, 410
- 9:1 413, 414
- 9:1-5 412-13
- 9:1-10 411, 413-16
- 9:1-14 269n1
- 9:1-28 411-28
- 9:1-10:18 4, 17n81, 378, 394, 411
- 9:2 340n132, 385n77,
403n162, 413n198,
414n202, 415n207,
420n224, 425n245
- 9:2-3 413
- 9:2-7 414
- 9:3 137, 187n219, 340n132,
387, 390n106, 403n162,
420n224, 423n232,
423n235
- 9:6 340n132, 403n162,
412-13, 415n207,
420n224
- 9:6-10 272n18, 386, 415n207,
416-17, 420
- 9:7 269n2, 412-13, 416,
416n212, 418-19,
418n217, 423n235
- 9:7-8 414n202
- 9:7-10 383
- 9:8 340n132, 382n61,
398n141, 402n161, 414,
415n207, 416n211, 421,
420n224, 423, 423n235
- 9:8-9 415
- 9:8-10 412, 414, 425

Hebrews (cont.)

9:9	305-6, 306n144, 375, 375n25, 383n66, 414-15, 414n202, 415n207, 430n270	9:22	282n40, 351, 418n217, 422, 421n228, 422n229
9:9-10	414	9:23	2n6, 57n153, 282n40, 315n17, 348n170, 372, 373n16, 406n173, 407, 409n190, 421, 422-25, 427
9:10	18, 415	9:23-24	423, 427n253
9:11	10, 207n49, 269n2, 306, 340n132, 355n207, 356n211, 372n11, 384n73, 397n133, 403, 412, 419-20, 420n224, 431n274, 432	9:23-28	411, 418, 422-28
9:11-12	361, 373n17, 386n78, 412, 416-21, 416-17n212, 420n224, 434	9:24	10, 345n152, 356n211, 370, 371n7, 372, 372n11, 373n16, 380n53, 398n141, 400n149, 400n150, 421n226, 423, 425-27, 426n250, 427n254
9:11-14	156n60, 361, 411-12, 416-21, 416n211, 425	9:25	269n2, 345n152, 380n53, 382n61, 398n141, 402n161, 416n212, 418n215, 418n217, 423, 423n235
9:11-22	351	9:25-28	423
9:12	10, 187n219, 345n152, 372n11, 380n53, 382n61, 398n141, 400, 402n161, 418, 418n217, 423, 423n235	9:26	309n160, 420n223, 430
9:13	283n41, 386n81, 387, 418n217	9:28	291, 309n160, 328n77, 367n267, 393n119, 416n212, 422
9:13-14	416	10	337
9:14	282n40, 283n41, 309n160, 400, 416, 416n212, 418-19, 418n217, 421	10-13	273
9:15	337n120, 346, 400, 421, 421n228	10:1	155n58, 305-6, 338, 344n151, 380n47, 380n53, 382n59, 409, 409n187, 409n188, 412, 417n213, 428-31, 428n261, 431n274
9:15-17	422	10:1-4	14, 14n66, 15, 269, 272n18, 428, 430n269
9:15-22	411, 421-22, 424	10:1-18	422, 428
9:16-17	421, 421n227	10:2	14, 282n40, 283n41, 428, 430
9:18	383n67, 387, 418n217, 421n227, 425n243	10:3	428
9:18-20	422	10:4	418n217, 428, 430
9:19	386n81, 387n86, 418n217, 421n227	10:5	291, 345n152, 380n53, 428
9:19-21	387	10:5-6	430
9:20	418n217, 422n229	10:5-10	18, 428
9:21	340n132, 386n81, 387n86, 418n217, 420n224, 424	10:6	428
9:21-22	422	10:8	414n202, 428
9:21-24	402	10:9	430-31

- 10:10 301n122, 309n160,
416n212, 420n223, 428,
430
- 10:11 15n73, 414n202, 428
- 10:11–12 14, 15, 269, 283,
429n262
- 10:11–13 370
- 10:11–14 269n1, 428
- 10:12 4n12, 375, 276n5,
416n212, 428
- 10:12–13 140n338, 164n112, 275
- 10:13 76n247
- 10:14 306, 306n144, 328n77,
428, 430
- 10:15–18 428
- 10:17 395
- 10:17–18 395
- 10:18 410, 428, 430
- 10:19 301n122, 381–83,
382n62, 385, 385n77,
398n141, 402n161,
418n217, 423n235
- 10:19–21 315n19, 381–82
- 10:19–23 345n154
- 10:19–25 4, 11, 348, 369–70,
370n5, 373–88, 382n58
- 10:19–13:25 11n50, 273
- 10:20 137, 383n67, 384
- 10:21 269n2, 377n32,
397n133, 398
- 10:22 139n330, 155n58, 336,
343n146, 344, 345n154,
363, 380n47, 380n53,
381–82, 386–87,
386n81, 400n149
- 10:23 336, 343n146, 390n101,
390n104
- 10:24 336, 343n146
- 10:25 12, 139n330, 356n212
- 10:26 381
- 10:26–31 18, 336, 350
- 10:26–39 4
- 10:26–13:25 369, 431
- 10:28 139n330
- 10:30 289n70
- 10:32 337, 343n146
- 10:32–12:7 337
- 10:33 363n249
- 10:34 2n6
- 10:35 336–37, 414n202
- 10:35–11:39 337
- 10:36 336–37, 337n120
- 10:37 356n212
- 10:37–38 300n121
- 10:38–12:2 337
- 11 4, 337–38, 337n118,
337n120, 338n122,
338n123, 339n128,
342–43, 343n145, 350
- 11:1 337–38, 337n118,
338n121, 389–90,
430n267
- 11:1–12:7 337
- 11:3 338n122
- 11:4 338, 351n184, 420n223
- 11:5 30n5, 150n33, 338,
354n204
- 11:6 73n228, 344, 380n47,
380n48, 381n53, 382n59
- 11:7 30n5, 139n330, 338,
420n223
- 11:8 341n138, 342n143
- 11:8–10 340n133
- 11:8–16 16, 327n75, 333n102,
336–43, 365n258, 368
- 11:8–22 338
- 11:9 337n120, 338n126,
340n133, 420n224
- 11:9–10 340n131
- 11:10 206n45, 293, 333n106,
336n117, 340, 347–48,
391n112
- 11:10–16 204n25
- 11:11 423n231
- 11:12 30n5, 372
- 11:13 337n120, 338, 341,
341n137
- 11:13–16 338n126, 341–42
- 11:14 365, 391n112
- 11:14–15 341
- 11:16 2n6, 8n28, 73n228, 278,
315n17, 315n21, 333n106,
340n133, 348, 348n170,
384n73, 409n189
- 11:17 30n5, 337n120
- 11:20 351n184
- 11:21–22 338n126
- 11:26 337, 363n249

Hebrews (cont.)

11:23-28	338	12:22	14n64, 142, 155n58, 204n25, 223n140, 293, 305n137, 315n17, 333n106, 335, 336, 340n133, 342, 344, 344n150, 345n153, 347, 348n172, 380, 381n53, 382n59, 409n189
11:27	30n5, 338n122	12:22-24	9n37, 10, 16, 88, 231, 327n75, 333n102, 347-52, 358, 368, 381n53
11:28	288n67, 347n161, 418n217	12:23	288n67, 289n68, 306, 306n144, 372
11:29-30	338-39	12:24	2n6, 301n122, 344, 346, 351n184, 418n217
11:31	338	12:25	343-44, 343n146, 345n153, 351n184, 352, 352n192, 372 356n212
11:32	12, 13n57	12:25-27	214, 214n92, 343n148, 352-58, 352n191, 355n208, 355n208
11:33	337n120, 420n223	12:26	293, 354, 356, 372,
11:35	2n6	12:26-27	356-57, 372n12
11:39	337, 337n120, 420n223	12:26-28	354
11:40	2n6, 306, 350	12:27	354, 354n204, 355n207, 356n212, 357-58, 365n257
12	293-94, 337, 337n118, 349n174	12:27-28	357
12-13	343n146	12:28	74n235, 293-94, 333n106, 343n146, 360, 372n12, 420n223
12:1	337, 337n118, 343n146, 390n102	13	4, 10n44, 358, 358n224, 358n225, 359n228, 435
12:1-2	18, 338n123, 343	13:2	343n146, 420n223
12:1-3	4	13:3	343n146
12:2	164n112, 4n12, 5, 139-40, 140n338, 272, 276n5, 301n122, 305n137, 306, 309n160, 337-38, 378, 390n102	13:7	30n5, 343n146, 359, 414n202
12:3	337, 343n146, 375n25, 383n66, 393n119	13:7-17	359n227
12:3-17	343	13:7-19	359
12:4	418n217	13:8	301n122, 359
12:4-17	4	13:9	343n146, 359n228, 365
12:5	414n202	13:9-10	359n228, 360n232
12:7	337	13:9-14	269n1, 359n228
12:10	364	13:10	34n23, 139n330, 272n18, 340n132, 359, 359n228, 360n229, 360n230, 420n224
12:12	30n5, 343n146	13:10-12	359
12:13	343n146		
12:14	343n146, 344, 364,		
12:14-17	343-44		
12:15	343, 420n223		
12:16	404n165		
12:18	155n58, 344, 345n153, 346-47, 381n53, 382n59		
12:18-21	346-47, 352, 356-57, 357n213, 380, 381n53		
12:18-24	17n81, 88n46, 214n92, 343-52, 343n148, 345n153, 351n184		
12:18-29	4, 342, 343n148, 368		
12:19	352n192		
12:20	347n161		
12:21	344n151		

13:10–16	17n81, 271n8, 358–67, 359n228, 368, 385n77	1:20	278n16
13:11	269n2, 359, 361n240, 362, 382n61, 398n141, 402n161, 418n217, 423, 423n235	1:21	304n136
13:11–12	361, 418n217	3:21	426–27, 427n253, 427n254
13:11–14	16	3:22	276n5, 299n113, 299n114, 299n115, 301n123
13:12	301n122, 309n160, 360–61, 420n223	4:13–14	304n136
13:12–14	13	5:4	304n136
13:13	88, 343n146, 359n228, 360	5:10	304n136
13:13–14	269n1, 327n75, 333n102, 336	2 Peter	
13:13–16	359, 361	1:9	282
13:14	11, 18, 88, 204n25, 266, 291n79, 293, 333n106, 340n133, 342, 348, 356n211, 360, 361n239, 365, 365n258, 391n112	1:11	382n62, 382n63
13:14–15	232	2:6	408n178
13:15	102n116, 189n233, 343n146, 365n261, 384n73	2:22	387n84
13:15–16	86n40, 88, 360	3:3	278n16
13:16	343n146, 360n229, 366	1 John	
13:17	13n57, 343n146	2:8	400n149
13:18	12, 13n57, 343n146, 359n226	5:29	400n149
13:18–19	12n57	Jude	
13:19	13, 13n57	14	186n215
13:19–20	300n121	15	282n35
13:20	139n330, 301n122, 377n32, 400, 418n217	18	278n16
13:21	301n122	Revelation	
13:22	10, 13n57, 272	1:4	378n40
13:22–25	358n224	1:5	288n67
13:23	13, 13n57	2:7	230n181
13:24	13, 341n137, 343n146	3:7	400n149
James		3:12	57n153, 181n194, 348n171
3:17	379n45	3:14	400n149
5:9	15n73	3:20	15n73
5:10	408n178	3:21	140n338, 277n13, 378n40
1 Peter		4:1	190n235
1:3	379n45	4:2–10	378n40
1:11	304n136	4:3	42n63
1:14	188n223	4:6–8	229n178
		4:24–26	
		5:1–13	378n40
		5:11–12	349n175
		6:9	140n343
		6:10	400n149
		6:16	378n40
		7:9–17	378n40
		8:3–4	57n153

Revelation (cont.)

8:3-5	140n343
8:10	247n266
9:1-11	247n266
10:1	42n63
11:19	10n42, 57n153
12:5	378n40
12:7-9	105-6n142
13:6	57n153, 135n311, 340n132
13:14	335n116
14:3	378n40
14:10	186n215
14:18	57n153
15:3	400n149
15:5	57n153, 135n311, 340n132
15:5-8	10n42
16:7	400n149
16:17	190n238
18	201n12
18:2	8n28
19:2	400n149
19:4-5	378n40
19:9	400n149
19:11	400n149
19:11-16	284n52
19:13	386n81
20:11	378n40
21-22	94n74, 204n25, 206n42
21:1-2	358n222
21:1-4	217n110, 348n171
21:1-22:5	7
21:2	8n28, 181n194
21:3	135n311, 340n132, 378n40, 403n163
21:5	378n40, 400n149
21:9-22:7	217n110
21:10	281n32
21:12	281n32
21:14	100n106, 206n45, 341n135
21:15-27	403n162
21:16	7, 95n83, 160n89, 248n273
21:19	206n45, 341n135
21:22	10n42, 160n94, 204n25
21:24	7
21:26	354n199

21:27

7

22:1-2

155n55

22:2

181n194, 230n181

22:6

400n149

22:16

247n266

Apocrypha

Baruch

1:8-10

212n81

2:16

148n23

4:8-5:9

209n65

5:7-9:1

304n136

Judith

4:1

89n47

4:12

399n141

4:14

188n225

5

341n138

5:8

341n138

6:11

363n248

8:18

243n246

8:21

399n141

8:24

399n141

9:8

321, 321n41, 325,

331n94, 399n141

10:8

307n151

10:9

307n148

16:20

399n141

1 Maccabees

1:11

393n118

1:22

48n100, 48n102

1:41

174n159

2:7-12

206n40

2:23

380n48

3:51

399n141

3:58

399n141

3:59

399n141

4:27

341n138

4:36

383n67, 399n141

4:41

399n141

4:41-51

48n100

4:43

399n141

4:48

399n141

4:54

383n67

4:57

383n67

5:1

383n67

7:42

399n141

10:20	377n32	5:21	393n118
10:32	377n32	6:2	260n323
10:38	377n32	6:6	334n109
10:42	188n225	6:28	407n176
10:69	377n32	6:31	407n176
12:3	377n32	7:24	354n204
12:6	377n32	6:2	260n323
12:7	377n32	6:4	374n20
13:36	377n32	6:6	334n109
13:42	377n32	8:21	342n139
14:15	399n141	8:27	334n110
14:17	377n32	8:33	342n139
14:23	377n32	9:16	260n323
14:27	377n32	10:3	260n323
14:29	399n141	10:6	260n323
14:30	377n32	10:19	393n118
14:31	399n141	10:29-31	105n142
14:41	377n32	11:6	105n142
15:4	341n138	12:12	393n118
15:17	377n32, 399n141	12:25	133n10
15:21	377n32	13:3	342n139
15:24	377n32	13:10	342n139
16:12	377n32	13:14	342n139
16:24	377n32	13:18	342n139
17:18	377n32	14:3	377n32
		14:13	377n32
		14:33	62n177
2 Maccabees		15:1	321n40, 325
1:29	9n37	15:2	377n32
2:4-8	212n81	15:23	105n142
2:9	307		
2:17-18	9n37	Odes	
3	63n184	1:17	8n28
3:1	377n32	2:3	282n36
3:4	377n32	2:43	286
3:9	377n32		
3:10	377n32	Sirach	
3:16	377n32	1:28	155n58
3:21	377n32	1:30	155n58
3:24	165n118	2:1	155n58
3:26	74n236	2:2	30n5
3:32	377n32	2:18	282n36
3:33	377n32	4:10	32n13
4:1	342n139	4:14	188n225
4:13	377n32	4:15	39n48
4:14	260n323	5:6	321n40, 325n64
4:46	354n204	6:9	354n204
5:8	342n139	6:26	32n16
5:9	342n139	6:31	38n44
5:15	342n139		

Sirach (cont.)

7:9	32n13	24:12	34
7:15	32n13	24:15	35, 35n29
7:29-31	30n3	24:19	34
7:30	32n16, 185n210, 399n143, 399n147	24:22	35n28
7:31	47n96	24:23	31, 32n13
7:32	307n151	24:23-39	31
8:13	32n16	24:25-27	35n26
9:15	32n13	24:28	35, 36n38
10:2	399n147	24:30	35n30
12:2	32n13	24:30-33	31
12:6	32n13	24:34	31n7
14:25	187n218	25:23	30n5
14:27	187n218	26:5	32n15
15:5	32n15	26:16	32n13
15:14-20	36n38	27:17	313n10
17:1-8	38n45	28:7	32n13
17:1-14	36n38	29:3	313n10
17:17	30n5, 297n107	29:11	32n13
17:26	32n13	29:14-20	30n5
17:27	32n13	29:20	32n16
17:32	32, 32n16	30:8	341n138
18:5	282n36	30:17	324n60
19:17	32n13	31:10	307n151
21:17	32n15	31:11	32n15
23:18	32n13	33:15	32n13
23:23	32n13	33:18	31n7
23:24	32n15	33:19	30n5, 32n15
24	37, 38n44, 78, 210n73, 323n58, 331n92, 404n165	34:6	32n13
24:1	31, 37n44	34:8	307n148
24:1-2	31, 33	34:18-35:11	367n266
24:1-33	31	34:19	32n13
24:2	31, 32, 32n13, 32n16	35:5	32n13
24:3	32n13, 33, 33n19	35:7	47n96
24:3-7	33, 33n19	35:9	32n13
24:3-22	31	35:19	32n13
24:4	33, 281n34	36	30n1
24:5	33n19, 40n53	36:12	48n104
24:6	33n19	36:18	347n165
24:8	34	36:27	187n218
24:8-12	33	37:15	32n13
24:10	34, 188n225	38:2	32n13
24:10-11	30n3, 362n243	38:18	341n138
24:10-12	33, 34n23	38:33	32n15
24:11	34	39:1	32n13
		39:5	32n13
		39:10	32n15
		39:15	282n36
		41:4	32n13

41:8 32n13
 42:15-43:33 41
 43:1-5 41
 43:2 32n13
 43:6-10 41
 43:9 32n13
 43:11-12 41
 43:12 32n13
 44-50 30, 36, 37n39, 338n123
 44:3 32n16
 44:15 32n15
 44:16 30n5, 36n37, 354n204,
 407n176
 44:17 30n5
 44:20 30n5, 32n13
 44:21 30n5
 45:2 158n75, 312n7
 45:6 30n3
 45:6-22 37n42
 45:7-8 42n66
 45:8 38n44, 53n130
 45:10 47n96
 45:15 188n225, 308n152
 45:23-26 37n42
 45:24 399n141
 46:5 32n13, 32n16
 46:7 32n15
 47:5 32n13
 47:8 32n13
 47:13 324, 324n61, 325
 48:5 32n13
 48:17-22 37n42
 49:4 32n13
 49:11-13 37
 49:12 30n3
 49:14 36n37
 49:16 36n38, 37, 38n44,
 42n66, 42n68
 50 30, 36-38, 38n44,
 39n48, 58n159, 78,
 331n92
 50:1 37, 38n44, 40, 42n66
 50:1-2 39, 51n119
 50:1-4 38, 39, 47
 50:1-11 53
 50:1-24 36
 50:2 40
 50:2-3 40n52

50:3 39, 40, 51n121
 50:4 39
 50:5 38-39n48, 41, 42n66
 50:5-10 38, 39n48, 41
 50:5-21 39n48
 52:6-10 41
 50:7 32n13
 50:8 42n63
 50:9 39n48
 50:11 37-38n44, 42, 53n130
 50:11-13 42, 42n70
 50:11-21 38, 39n48, 42
 50:13 32n15
 50:14 32n13, 43, 43n73,
 399n143,
 43
 50:14-19 43
 50:14-21 43
 50:15 32n13
 50:16 32n13
 50:16-19 42n66
 50:17 43
 50:19 32n13, 43, 307n151
 50:20 32n15, 37n44
 50:20-21 43
 50:21 32n13

Tobit

1:4 159n79, 179n184
 1:6 47n96
 5:11 342n139
 8:15 131n284
 11:4 186n215
 12:6 282n36
 12:11-15 186
 12:15 134n297
 13:4 282n36
 13:8 282n36
 13:9 282n36
 13:10-16 348n171
 13:14-17 304n136
 13:16-18 204n25
 14:2 282n36
 14:5 51n119, 182n199, 204n25
 14:5-6 249n279

Wisdom of Solomon

1:1-6:11 56
 1:1-11:1 56n148

Wisdom of Solomon (cont.)

1:3	393n118
4:10	354n204
4:13	307n151
5:16–23	55n142
6:12–9:18	56
7:16	55n146
9:1–18	56
9:4	139n328, 285n52, 378n37
9:7	56
9:7–12	56
9:8	56, 56n152, 57, 57n155, 57n156, 58, 59, 78, 331n92
9:9	58n158
9:10	56, 57n155, 186n215, 190n238
9:12	56
10	338n123
10–19	56
10:1–11:1	56n148
11:2–19:22	56n148
13:1	340n134
14:1	289n72
14:8	243n246
14:16–20	55n142
18:15	58n159
18:24	58, 58n158, 256n307, 282n36

Pseudepigrapha

Apocalypse of Abraham

1–8	226
8:1–2	230n180
8:6	227
9–32	226
9:1–10	227
9:5	227
9:6	227n165, 227, 228n171
9:8	227, 228n172, 229
9:9–10	227
10:3	227, 230n180, 284n51
10:12	227n165
12:3	227
12:4	228
12:10	228
12:22–24	231
13:14	229n173

14:1	228
15:1–4	228–29
15:1–7	227
15:5–7	229
16:3	229
16:3–4	230n180
17:2	230n180
17:18–21	229
18	223n140, 229
18:14	230n180
19:1	230
19:1–9	230
19:3	227n165
19:4	229n175
19:6	229n175
20	230
21	230
21:1–7	230
21:3–4	230
21:6	230
21:6–7	230
22:4–5	230
25–27	230–31
26:3–5	227n165
27	231
27:1–2	226
27:1–8	227
27:6	228n172
28	231
29	231, 231n183
29:4–13	226n163, 230n183
29:14–21	231
29:17	232
29:17–18	231
29	231
29:4–13	231n183
29:29	231
32:6	226

Apocalypse of Zephaniah

6	287n61
8	223n140

Ascension of Isaiah

7–10	187n216
7:10	6n19
7:13	223n140
7:14	189n231
7:15–17	189n233
7:20	223n140

7:21	189n231	10:5	213n87
7:27	189n231	10:8-17	211n75
7:29	223n140	10:18	213n88, 216n104
7:36	223n140	14:18	212n83
8:17-20	223n140	22:8	213n88
9:24-26	140n338, 277n13	25:1-5	228n172
9:27-32	223n140	28:2	208n53
11:32	292n85	31-43	213-14
		31:1-32:6	213
2 Baruch		31:4	214
1	210n72	31:5	214
1-5	211n74	32	214
1-9	209n59	32:1	214, 214n94
1:1	208n53	32:2	214
1:2-3	213	32:2-4	204n25, 208n54, 212n84
1:1-5:7	209-11	32:2-5	214
2:1-2	208n52	32:3	214, 218, 265
3	210	32:4	212, 212n83, 249n279
3:7	211	32:6	214
3:1-9	209-10, 216	34-35	214
3:4-6	210	34:1	187n219, 211n78, 216n104
3:4-9	211n75, 213		
4	212	36-42	213
4:1-2	210	39-40	213
4:1-7	216	40:2	212n85
4:2-4	204n25	40:3	212n83
4:2-6	210n72	43:1	212n83
4:2-7	6n19, 348n171	44:1	212n83
4:3	210, 210n67, 215	44:5-7	213
4:3-5	181n194	51	217, 217n110, 218
4:5	210, 215, 215n98	53	214
4:6	211	53:1-77:26	214-17
5:1	210	55:3-74:4	214
5:2	212n83	56:2	214
5:5	208n52, 210n70	59:2	212n83
6:1-9:1	211-13	59:3	215
6:4	211n77	59:3-12	354n203
6:7	211	59:4	210n70, 215, 216n104
6:8	211	61:1-8	211n75
6:9	212n84, 218	61:2	216, 216n104
7-8	213	61:7	208n54
7:1	211n77, 213	64:2	216n104
8:1	211n77	64:6	216, 216n104
8:1-2	213	66	216n107
8:2	216n107	66:6	212n83
8:4	213n88	67:7	217
10-77	209n59	68:5	217, 249n279, 265
10:1-12:5	213	68:6	217
10:2-4	208n52	70	217
10:4	213n90		

2 Baruch (cont.)

71-74	217, 217-18n110
71:1	212n85
73	333n106
73:1	212n83, 217
73:2	217
73:7	217
73-74	217n110
78-87	208n56, 209n59
78:6	212n83
78:7	212n83
80:3	213n87, 213n88
82	211n79

3 Baruch

Prologue 2	187n219
1:2G	220
1:3G	220
1:4G	220
1:4S	220n124
1:6G	220, 221, 220n124
1:7	221
1:8G	220n124
1:8S	220n124
2	220
2-3	221
2:2	190n235
2:3	374n20
2:5	190n235
2:5G	222
2:5S	222
2:7	222
3:1	190n235
3:5-6	222
4:2	222n138
4:2S	221n130
4:7-8	222
4:12-15	222
4:15	222
4:16S	222
6:13	190n235
7:2	221n130
10:7	189n233
11:1	222n138
11:1-2	223
11:2	190n235, 221n130
11:2G	223
11:5	190n235, 223n143
11:6	223n142

11:8G	223
11:9	223n143
12:1G	224
12:1S	224
12:1-5	223
12:1-8	189n230
12:5	223n143
12:6-7	224
12:6-13:5	224
13:4G	224n146
13:4S	224n146
14	141n347
14:2	223
15:1	190n235
15:1G	223
15:1S	223
15:2G	223
15:2	223n143
15:2S	223
15:3G	224n146
15:3S	224, 224n146
16:2-4	220n123
16:3-4G	224
16:3-7S	224
16:4G	224n146
16:4S	221n130, 224n146
17:1G	223n142

4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou)

3:9-19	212n81
--------	--------

1 Enoch

1-5	145, 149
1-16	157
1-36	145, 149n29
1:1-2	165
1:2	146
1:3	147n16, 153n44
1:3-4	147, 157
1:4	147n16, 169n137,
	394n124
1:4-9	146
1:9	131n284, 186n215
2:1-5:9	146
5-16	349n175
6-11	145, 149-50, 149n27,
	149n29
6-16	149, 149n25
6:6	151n37

7:3-4	149	15:3	148n23, 151-52, 154, 186n215
9:1	148-49, 153n44	15:5	153n44
9:1-11	149	15:15	154
9:2	190n235	16:4	156
9:4	153n44, 190n238	17-36	72, 145, 150n31, 156-57
9:10	190n235	17:1-19:3	156
10	149	17:2	156
10:12	180n188	18:8	156
12-16	145, 148-56, 149n27, 149n29, 149-50n31	20:1-8	134n297, 156n63
12:1-2	149, 150n33	21:1-36:4	156
12:2	150n33	22:3-4	350n180
12:3-13:3	150	24:3	156
12:4	151, 153n44, 154	24:6	157
13:4-7	75n238, 150	24:6-25:7	157
13:7	157	25:3	157, 187n217
13:7-10	152n39	25:5-6	157
13:8	150, 152n39	25:7	187n217
13:8-15:1	150	26:1	195n262, 248n273
13:9	150n34	26:2	157
14	74n237, 153n44, 154n52, 155n53, 170n138	39:6	166
14-16	72, 166	37	169n135
14:8	151	37-71	145, 164, 164n111
14:8-23	151n37, 152, 191n239, 398n140	37:1	164n111
14:9-10	169	37:1-5	165
14:9-14a	154	37:5	164n111, 165
14:10	154	38:1	164n111, 166
14:12	190n235	38:1-6	167
14:13	154	38:1-44:1	165-67, 165n116
14:15	190n235	38:2	165-66
14:15-25	190n235	38:4	166n123
14:16	155n53	38:5	166n123
14:18	378n37, 397	39-40	166
14:18-23	189n234, 190n238	39:1	166n123
14:19	187n217	39:3	166
14:21	155, 155n57	39:4	166n123
14:21-23	155n57, 186n215	39:4-5	166, 333n106
14:22	155n57	39:5	166, 166n123
14:22-23	155n57, 186n215	39:6	166
14:23	131n284, 155n57	39:7	166
14:24	155, 170	39:8	166
14:24-16:4	152	39:10-14	169n136
14:25	186n215, 190n235	39:12	77n250, 165n118
15:1	155	40	223n140
15:2	75n238	40:1	166
15:2-16:4	150	40:3-4	189n233
		40:8	166
		40:9	166

1 Enoch (cont.)

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|------------|------------------------------|
| 41:2 | 166n123 | 56:4 | 167n129 |
| 41:7 | 334n110 | 56:5 | 105n142 |
| 41:8 | 350n180 | 56:5-6 | 297n107 |
| 42:1-2 | 34n22 | 56:6 | 164n113 |
| 43:1-2 | 106n146 | 57:2 | 166n123 |
| 43:4 | 164n111, 166n123 | 57:3 | 164n111 |
| 43:8 | 164n113 | 58:1 | 164n111 |
| 45:1 | 164n111, 166n123, 167 | 58:1-69:29 | 165n116 |
| 45:1-2 | 167 | 58:3 | 166n123 |
| 45:1-57:3 | 165n116, 167-68 | 58:5 | 166n123 |
| 45:3 | 139n328, 140n338,
277n113, 285n52,
304n136, 378n37 | 60:4 | 166n123 |
| | 167, 333n106 | 61:8 | 140n338, 166n123,
277n113 |
| 45:3-6 | 167 | 61:10 | 76n248, 166n123,
189n231 |
| 45:5-6 | 167 | 61:10-12 | 122n230 |
| 45:6 | 167 | 61:10-13 | 189n233 |
| 46 | 167 | 61:12 | 166n123 |
| 46:1 | 166n123 | 62:1 | 164n113 |
| 46:3 | 170 | 62:3 | 164n113 |
| 46:8 | 168n132 | 62:5 | 140n338, 277n113 |
| 47-48 | 167 | 62:6 | 164n113 |
| 47:2 | 166n123 | 62:8 | 166n123 |
| 47:3 | 187n217 | 62:9 | 164n113 |
| 47:4 | 166n123 | 63:1 | 164n113 |
| 48:1 | 166n123 | 63:5 | 334n110 |
| 48:2-5 | 284n51 | 63:12 | 164n113 |
| 48:5 | 287n61 | 65:12 | 166n123 |
| 48:7 | 166n123 | 67:2 | 158n75 |
| 48:9 | 166n123 | 68:1 | 164n111 |
| 49 | 167 | 69:5 | 166n123 |
| 50:1 | 166n123 | 69:13 | 166n123 |
| 51:1-5 | 167 | 69:13-29 | 284n51 |
| 51:2 | 166n123 | 69:27 | 285n52 |
| 51:3 | 140n338, 277n113,
285n52 | 69:29 | 140n338, 164n111,
277n113 |
| 52:1-56:4 | 167 | 70-71 | 165, 169 |
| 53:4-9 | 168n129 | 70:1-2 | 169 |
| 52:6 | 165n119, 168n129 | 70:3-4 | 169 |
| 52:7 | 167n129 | 71 | 169n136, 170n138 |
| 52:9 | 165n119 | 71:1 | 166n123 |
| 53:1-5 | 167 | 71:1-4 | 155, 169n136 |
| 53:5 | 167n129 | 71:5 | 169-70 |
| 53:6 | 165n119, 333n106 | 71:5-16 | 169 |
| 53:6-7 | 167, 167n129 | 71:5-17 | 169n136 |
| 53:7 | 164n113, 167-68n129 | 71:7 | 304n136 |
| 54:6 | 167-68n129 | 71:8 | 166n123 |
| 55:4 | 140n338, 277n113,
285n52 | 71:9 | 166n123 |
| | | 71:13 | 170n140 |

71:14 165, 169n135, 169n136,
170
71:17 169
72-82 145
72:2-37 41n60
83-84 158
83-90 145, 158
85-90 145, 158
85:3-90:41 158
86:1-3 158n74
89:1 158n75
89:9 158n75
89:28-38 158
89:36 158, 160, 312n7
89:39-50 159
89:40 158, 179n185
89:50 159-61, 179n185
89:50-65 159
89:54 159n85, 179n185
89:56 179n185
89:66 179n185
89:66-67 159
89:72 158n75, 159, 179n185,
194n257
89:73 19n90
89:73-74 217n108
90:5 194n257
90:6-12 161
90:9-16 158n74
90:19 162n102
90:26 195n262
90:26-39 348n171
90:28-29 91, 159-60, 249n279,
398n140
90:29 95n83, 160n88,
182n199, 248n273
90:30 159
90:34 159
90:36 248n273
91-105 161
91:11 161
91:12-17 161
91:13 162
91:14 162
91:17 162
92-105 145
93:1-10 161
93:3 162
93:4 162

93:5 162
93:6 162
93:7 162
93:8 162, 162n104
93:9 162
93:10 161
102:3 187n217
103:3-4 350n180
106-107 145
108 145
108:12 140n338, 277n13

2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse)

1 74
1-68 72
2:2 72n221
3 74
3:12 210n68
3-37 72
7:3-5 76n245
7:5 75n238
8:3 181n194
8:8 223n140
8:21 223n140
9:1 75
11-16 75
12:1 76n246
15:1 76n246
17 189n233
18 75n243
18:3 76n245
18:6-9 75
18:7 75n239
19:6 76n246, 189n233
19:17-19 76n244
20:1 189n231
20:3 76
20:4 77
21:1 77n250, 189n233
22 189n234
22:2 189n238
22:7 287n61
22:8-10 304n136
24:1-4 277n13
29:3 76n248
30:11-12 74n231
30:13 71n214
31:5 76n245
31:12 210n68

2 Enoch (Slavonic Apocalypse) (cont.)

33:6	74n236
37	75n237
38–68	72
51:4	71, 73
53:1–2	73n231
55:2	204n25, 348n171
56:2	75n237
59:2	73, 73n231
59:3	72n224
61:4	73
62:1	73, 73n228
64:2	73
64:5	73n226
65:7	74
65:8	75n242
66:7	74
68	72n223
68:5	73
69–73	72
71:12–23	70n214
71:32–33	71n214
71:34–37	71n214
71:35–36	73n229
72:5	73n226
72:6–7	71n214

3 Enoch (Hebrew Apocalypse)

7	397
10:1	139n328, 285n52,
	378n37
12:1–5	284n51
15B:1	136n313
16	277n13
17:3	106n145
22B: 3	154n48
23:18	181n194
48:1	284n51
48C:7	284n51

4 Esdras (Vulgate)

1–2	199–200,n2
1:7	196n266
4–13	199
15–16	200n2

4 Ezra

3:1	199n2
3:1–3	200, 201

3:1–5:20	202
3:4–36	201
3:6	205n32
3:13–14	210n69
3:19	199n2
3:24	200n7, 202, 206,
	210n66
4:1–5:13	201
5:14–20	201
5:21–30	199n2
5:21–6:34	201, 203
5:23–30	203
5:24	207
5:25	203, 206n41
5:27	199n2
5:35	200n5
5:50	209n65
6:1–6	203
6:4	203, 205n32
6:11–16	354n203
6:25–28	354n203
6:35–9:25	201, 203–5
6:54–59	204n23
6:55–59	199n2
6:59	207
7:10–11	199n2
7:19–20	199n2
7:26	206, 206n41, 348n171
7:26–[44]	204, 333n106
7:28–[44]	199n2
7:36	181n194, 204, 205n32
7:53[123]	230n181
7:63[133]	199n2
7:[79]–[81]	199n2
7:[89]	199n2
7:[91]	304n136
7:[94]	199n2
7:[98]	304n136
8:12	199n2
8:15–16	199n2
8:26	199n2
8:29	199n2
8:45	199n2
8:52	181n194, 204n26, 205,
	206n41, 333n106
8:53–54	183n33
8:56	199n2
8:29	199n2
8:45	199n2

8:52	181n194, 204n26, 205, 205n34, 348n171	15:11–12 22:9	287n61 333n106
8:56	199n2		
9:11	199n2	Jubilees	
9:24–25	201	1:1–29	172
9:26–10:59	201, 205–7	1:4–6	171n143
9:27	205	1:10	172–73
9:29–37	199n2	1:10–17	173
10:6–8	209n65	1:15–17	91, 249n279
10:20–22	199n2	1:17	9n38, 160n86, 172–74, 181n196, 182n199, 404n165
10:21	174n159		
10:21–24	206, 206n40		
10:25–28	354n203	1:19	174, 174n161
10:27	203, 206, 207, 341n135, 348n171	1:26–29	9n38, 92, 160n86, 173
10:38–54	199n2	1:27	174, 173n155
10:38–59	206	1:27–28	171n143
10:42	203, 206, 206n44	1:27–29	181n196, 182n199, 295n100
10:44	203, 206, 206n44	1:28	173n153
10:44–56	200n7	1:29	92n63, 174, 173n155, 173n157
10:46	200n7, 202n16, 207n47, 210n66	1:32	404n165
10:54	348n171	2	171n143
10:55	200n7, 206	2:1	172
11–12	200n5, 207n48	2:17–22	130n278
11:1–12:51	201	2:18	172
11:33–35	200n5	3	210n68
12:23–27	200n5	3:1–3	175n165
12:28	200n5	3:4–7	175
13:1–58	201, 207	3:6	175
13:6–7	207	3:8–14	175
13:35–36	199n2, 207	3:9	175
13:36	200n7, 202, 203, 207, 10:44–56	3:10	175
13:42	199n2	3:10–11	175n164
13:54	199n2	3:12	175
13:55–56	206n43	3:26–27	38n45
14:1–48	202	3:27	175
14:21–22	199n2	3:34	175n165
		4:15–26	171n146
		4:17–26	171n145
		4:19	172
Ezekiel the Tragedian		4:23–26	172, 176
68–89	139n328, 140n338, 277n13, 378n37	4:25	176n169
69–82	285n52	4:26	92n63, 172, 173, 176, 181n194
Joseph and Aseneth		5:1–12	171n146
8:11	333n106	6:1	173
15:7	333n106	6:3	173

Jubilees (cont.)

6:17–19	172
6:18	141n347
7:20–39	171n146
8:1–4	171n146
8:12	195n262
8:19	173, 176, 176n170, 248n273
10:1–17	171n146
11:16–12:14	226n158
13:9	173
13:16	173
15:2	173
15:32	297n107
18:1–13	173
18:13	228n170
22:3	173
23:21	172, 173, 173n155
24:23	173
25:21	173n155
30:7–17	146n8
30:18	185n210, 185n213, 187n222
31:14	115n193, 131n284, 172, 185n210, 185–86n213, 187n222, 349n175
32	30n3
32:1	190n236
32:16	173–74
32:16–26	173
32:23	174
49	171n142
49:16–17	174
49:16–21	174
49:18	173, 174
50	171n142
50:9	334n110

Liber antiquitatum biblicarum
(Pseudo-Philo)

11:8	334n110
11:15	234–35
12	233, 233n192
12:1	233
12:4	235, 235n205
12:8–9	234
12:9	210n73, 235–36
12:10	235n205
13	234n200

13:1	234–35
15:6	236n208
18:10–11	234n195
19:7	233n191, 235–36, 236n207, 237n215, 237n217
19:10	237n217, 238n221, 239n224
19:10–13	237, 237n217
19:12	238
19:12–13	410n194
19:13	238, 238n219
21	236
21:10	236
22:1–6	233n191
22:8	233n191, 236, 237n213
22:9	236, 237n213
23:12	234n195
25–27	235, 239–40
25:2	239
25:10–12	239
26:4	239
26:6	210n68, 240n229
26:8–11	239
26:12	235, 239
26:13	240, 240n228
28:3	233n191
28:4	234n195
28:6–9	238n221
30:4	234n195
39:7	234n195
61:8–9	233n194
64:6	233n194

Ladder of Jacob

1	251, 251n283
11–6	252n292
1:5	285n52
1:5–7	250n282
1:7–15	252n292
2	251, 253n298
2:7	139n328, 285n52, 378n37
2:18–19	250n282
3	251
4	251
5	251, 252n291
5:1	251–52
5:2	250n282

5:5	252n289	99	54
5:6	252	120-129	44n81
5:7-15	251n283, 253n296	128-171	44
5:16	253n296	143	407n176
5:17	253	182	45n82
6	253n297	187-300	44
6:1-15	253n296	234	189n233
		301	45n84
Letter of Aristeas		301-311	44n81
1	45, 45n85, 49, 49n109,	322	45, 45n85, 45n86
	53		
1-8	46	Life of Adam and Eve	
3	49	12-17	37n44
8	45, 45n86		
9-11	46	Life of Jeremiah	
9-82	44n81	2:12	212n81
12-27	46		
16	45	3 Maccabees	
28	45n82	1:11	377n32
28-34a	47	1:16	354n204
33	47	2:1	377n32
33-83	46	2:9	48n104
34b-51a	47	2:10	48n104
40	47, 47n97	2:14	48n104
42	47, 47n97	2:15	8n28
51-82	47	2:25	393nn18
51-83	44	4:19	313n10
52-53	48	5:5	399n147
53-72	48	5:50	393nn18
54	48	6:18	190n235
57	47n97		
57-58	48	4 Maccabees	
72	48	1:11	342n139
73-77	48	2:6	328n79
78	48	2:18	354n204
79	48	4:1	342n139
80-83	48	4:5	342n139
83	49, 53n132	4:13	377n32
83-99	46	4:16	377n32
83-120	44, 46, 49	4:20	342n139
84-87	49	5:28	328n79
88	51n120	7:13	328n79
88-91	51	7:15	307n151
92	51	8:16	328n79
92-95	51	16:16-23	338n123
95	185n210	17:18	378n40
96-98	58n159	17:21	342n139
96-99	53	17:23	407n176
97	240n230	18:4	342n139

Odes of Solomon

11:1–12:2	36n35
38:16–20	36n35

Psalms of Solomon

1:8	399n141
2:3	399n141
3:8	188n223
4:14	382n63
8:11	399n141
8:11–13	146n8
15:3	102n116, 367n266
17:21–34	249n279
17:49	131n284

Sibylline Oracles Prologue

9–90	59n164
------	--------

Sibylline Oracles Book 3

1–92	60n167
1–96	60
63–74	245
93–96	60n167
97–107	61n170
97–349	61
159	60
160	62n176
167	63n185
161	60
175–190	60
193	60
196–209	61
196–294	61
213	61
213–214	61
213–294	61
214–215	61
215–264	61
218	61
266	61, 62n177
267	61
274	61
277–279	62
281	62, 62n177
282–285	61
286	61, 247n264
288	61
290	61, 62n177
294	61, 64n187

295–488	60n169
308	187n219
314	63n185
318	60
328–329	63n185
350–488	61n170
489–829	61
545–656	62
564	63n181
565	63
573	62
575	62
576	62
577–578	62
579	62
608	60
625–657	62
657	63
657–660	64n187
657–808	63, 354n199
665	62n177
669–709	63
718	63
726	63n185
767–795	64
772	63, 63n185
772–773	63
774	63n185
776	60
787	348n171
825	63n185

Sibylline Oracles Book 4

1–48	242
8	243
10–11	243
24–30	243
27	243
47–48	241
49–101	241
88–101	241
102–151	241
107	242
115–118	242
116	242
125–126	242, 243n244
126	242n242
127	242
130–134	242n244

135-136	243n244	401	246
138	245	403-407	246
139	242	408-410	246
152-192	242	411	246
162-170	242	413	246
187-192	242n242	414	248
		414-434	248
Sibylline Oracles Book 5		420	248-49
1-51	244	422	249
47-50	244	423	249
51	244n249	423-425	249n279
52-110	244	425	249
93-100	246	432-433	249n279
106	246-47	433-434	249n279
108	247	435-530	244
111-178	244		
115-129	244	Testament of Benjamin	
130	201n12, 245	9:1-5	81-82
150-151	245	9:3-4	213n89
150-154	245	9:4	179n182
151-161	247		
152	245	Testament of Dan	
154	245	5:4	182n200
155	247	5:4-13	181
159	247	5:6	178n180, 181
159-160	247	5:7-8	181
160-161	247	5:7-13	182n200
179-285	244	5:10	176
214-226	245	5:12	181, 182n199, 204n25,
220-224	245		304n136
226-227	245	5:12-13	348n171
247-252	248	5:13	181
250	248		
250-251	348n171	Testament of Gad	
256	247	8:1	176, 182n200
256-259	244, 244n52,		
	248n270	Testament of Issachar	
257	248n270	5:6-8	182n200
258	247		
263	248	Testament of Joseph	
268	248	19:3	159n83
286-434	244	19:11-12	182n200
293	62n177		
361-410	246	Testament of Judah	
363-385	246	18:1	178n180
386-396	246	21:1-4	176
397	246	21:1-5	185n213
398	246	21:1-6	182n200
400	246	24	176

Testament of Levi

2-3	183, 184n208, 190n235
2-5	154, 191
2-7	146n8
2:1-5	189n234
2:2-5	184
2:3	152n39
2:5	184n207
2:5-10	184n208
2:5-3:10	184
2:6	190n235
2:7	190n235
2:7-8	184
2:9	184n208
2:9-11	185
2:10	183, 185n212, 188
3	186
3-4	191n239
3-5	197
3:1-8	183, 184
3:3	186, 186n215
3:3-4	190
3:3-8	184n208
3:4	155n54, 183, 186, 184n208, 190, 190n235, 393n121, 394n124
3:5	140n343, 187, 349n175
3:5-6	141n343, 141n347, 367n266
3:7	189
3:8	223n140
4:2	183, 184n207, 185n210, 392n115
4:2-3	191
5	190n235
5:1	190n235, 190n237, 304n136, 398n140
5:1-2	183
5:1-3	189-91
5:1-7	189n234
5:2	191, 190n236
8	184n207, 190n235, 197
8-9	190n236
8:2	134n297
8:3	183
8:10	308n152
9	183n205
9:3	183
10:2	179

10:3	179n182
10:5	159n79, 178n180, 179
12:5	183
14-16	183
14:1-15:4	179
14:1	178n180, 183
14:1-3	180n186
14:1-4	179
14:5	179
14:5-8	183
14:6	179-80, 183
15:1	180
15:1-16:5	183
16:1	178n180
16:1-5	180
16:3	180
18	176
18:1-14	185n212
18:2	183
18:6	183
19:2-3	183n201

Testament of Naphtali

4:1	178n180
5:3-6	182n200
8:11-2	182n200

Testament of Reuben

6:5-12	182n200
--------	---------

Testament of Simeon

5:4	178n180
7:1-2	185n212
7:1-3	176, 182n200

Testament of Zebulon

3:4	178n180
-----	---------

Testament of Abraham

11:3-10	304n136
A 15:1	308n156

Testament of Adam

4:4	189n231
4:8	189n231

Testament of Job

33:2	131n284
39:12	340n134

Testament of Moses

1:7	193
1:9	194
1:14	191n241, 195n262
1:17	195n262
1:17–18	193n250
1:18	195n262
2:2	195n262
2:3–4	194
2:4	194, 195n262
2:7	196
2:8–9	194
3:2	195n262
3:9	193n250
4:2	189n238
4:7	195–96
4:7–9	194n257
4:8	196, 195n263
4:9	196
5–6	192n247
5:1–3	196
5:3	196
5:4	196
6	196
6–7	192n247
6:1–9	194n254
6:2–6	192n247
6:3	195n262
6:6	192n247
7:10	195n262
8	192n247
8–9	192n247
8:5	193n250, 195n262
9	192n247
10	192n247, 193
10:1	193
10:8	192n247
10:9	195n262
11–12	193
11:5	195n262
11:7	195n262
12:4	195n262

Testament of Solomon

20:15	189n231
-------	---------

Dead Sea Scrolls

1Q19bis (1QNoah)

19	149n29
----	--------

1QapGen (1QGenesis Apocryphon)

II 1	131n284
XXII 3	365n259

1Q22 (1QDM, 1QWords of Moses)

IV 1	131n284
------	---------

1Q26 (1QInstruction)

3 2	109n163
-----	---------

1QS (1Q Community Rule)

I–IV	98, 98n98
I 8	120n220
I 16–II 5	116
I 18–22	117n202
I 18–III 12	121n224
II 2	120n220, 135n308
II 8	99n101
II 23	39n48
III 2	100n106
III 3	120n220
III 6	99n101
III 8	99n101
III 9	120n220
III 9–10	135n308
III 13–15	102n117
IV 22	120n220, 135n308
IV 23	37n44, 304n136
V	99
V–VI	98
V–XI	98
V 1	98
V 1–2	98n99
V 1–6	98
V 2	98
V 3–5	98
V 5	98n99
V 5–6	98n99, 99n101
V 5–7	98
V 6	98, 99, 98n99
VI 1	120n222
VI 3	100n106
VI 7	120n222
VI 8	120n222
VI 9	120n222
VI 10	100n106
VI 11	120n222
VI 12	120n222
VI 12–13	100n106
VI 13	120n222

1QS (1Q Community Rule) (cont.)

VI 14	100n106, 120n222
VI 15	120n222
VI 16	100n106
VI 17	120n222
VI 18	120n222
VI 20	120n222
VI 21	120n222
VI 22–23	100n106
VI 25	120n222
VII 2	100n106
VII 3	120n222
VII 5–9	120n222, 146n8
VII 10	120n222
VII 13	120n222
VII 16	120n222
VII 19	120n222
VII 20	120n222
VII 21	120n222
VII 22	100n106
VII 24	100n106, 120n222
VII 25	120n222
VII 1–16a	100
VIII 1	100, 100n106, 120n220
VIII 1–IX 25	100
VIII 5	100, 100n106, 110n165
VIII 5–6	100
VIII 5–10	110n165
VIII 5–12	100
VIII 6	99n101, 100
VIII 6–7	100n107
VIII 8–9	100
VIII 9	100, 120n220
VIII 9–11	367n266
VIII 10	99n101, 100, 120n218, 120n220, 135n308
VIII 11	101n109
VIII 16–IX 2	100
VIII 18	120n218, 120n220, 135n308
VIII 20	120n220
VIII 21	120n218, 120n220
VIII 22	100n106
IX	101
IX–XI	102n116
IX 2	120n220
IX 3–6	100
IX 3–11	100

IX 4	99n101, 101
IX 4–5	86n40, 101–2, 367n266
IX 5	102, 120n220, 135n308
IX 5–6	146n8
IX 6	120n218, 120n220
IX 8	120n218, 120n220
IX 9	102n119, 120n218, 120n220, 135n308
IX 12–X 5	102n117
IX 19	120n220
IX 26	102n116
IX 26–XI 22	102
X 6	102n116
X 14	102n116
XI 5–10	102
XI 6–9	123
XI 7–8	102, 131n284
XI 8	100n106, 102
XI 14	99n101

1QSa (1Q Rule of the Congregation)

I 1	103, 104n129, 278n17
I 28	120n220
I 28–II 1	103–4
II 3–4	103
II 4–5	103
II 5b–9	103
II 8	103n125
II 8–9	102n118, 103

1QSB (1QRule of Benedictions)

I–III	113n183
I 1	102n117, 113
I 2	120n220
I 3	113, 113n182
I 5	131n284
I 18–22	117n202
III	114n185
III 22	102n117, 113
III 23	113n182
III 25	113n182
IV	115n193
IV 22–V 19	113–14
IV 23	114
IV 24–25	185n210
IV 24–28	54n140, 186n213
IV 24–35	115n193
IV 25	113n184, 114, 114n187

IV 25–26 187n222
 IV 26 114, 114n187
 IV 27 114
 IV 28 114
 V 20 102n117, 113
 V 22 120n220
 V 29 113n183

1QM (1Q War Scroll)

I 10–11 105n139
 I 15 105n142
 I 16 131n284
 II 3 105n138
 VI 6 107, 125n247, 131n284
 VII 3–7 105n138
 VII 5 120n220
 VII 6 102n118, 104n128
 VII 6–7 105n139
 VII 11 105n138
 X–XIV 105
 X 10 107, 107n148
 X 11–12 131n284
 X 14 138n323
 X 18 105n138
 XI 106n144
 XI 17 105n139
 XII 106,
 XII 1 105n139, 131n284
 XII 1–2 107
 XII 1–4 107n152
 XII 1–5 106, 106n144, 107–8
 XII 2 106n147
 XII 3 107n150
 XII 4 106, 131n284
 XII 5 106, 107n151
 XII 6 106
 XII 6–9 108
 XII 7 105n139, 106, 107n148,
 131n284
 XII 7–8 104n128
 XII 7–17 106–7
 XII 8 107, 107n148
 XII 9 107
 XII 13–14 107–8
 XIV 7 120n220, 135n308
 XIV 14 105n142
 XV 13–14 105n142

XV 14 105n139, 131n284
 XVI 1 107, 125n247, 131n284
 XVII 5–6 105n142
 XVII 6–7 105n139
 XVII 8–9 105n142
 XVIII 1 104
 XVIII 1–3 105n142

1QH^a (Hodayot)

IV 26 304n136
 IV 27 37n44
 IX 37 135n308
 IX 38 120n220
 X 29 112n171
 XI 111
 XI 20 111
 XI 20–37 111
 XI 21 110–12, 222n139, 376n30
 XI 21–22 131n284
 XI 21–24 111
 XI 22 112
 XI 23 112
 XI 23–24 112
 XI 24–25 112
 XI 25–37 111
 XIII 15–17 124n243
 XIV 13 187n222
 XIV 15–21 111n168
 XIV 17–21 234n198
 XIV 18–21 36n35
 XVI 5–28 36n35
 XVII 35 131n284
 XIX 11–12 107n148
 XIX 13–17 111n168
 XXIII 30 111n168

2Q228 (4QText with a Citation of Jubilees)

I 5 101n109

3Q15 (3QCopper Scroll)

V 6 41n54
 VII 4 41n54
 X 5 41n54
 XI 12 41n54

4Q37 (4Q Deuteronomy^d)

XII 14 297n107

- 4Q44 (4Q Deuteronomy^a)
 II 5 ii 7 286n57 2 3 180n188
 2 5 180n188
- 4Q164 (4QIsaiah Pesher^d)
 I 1–8 100n106
- 4Q174 (4QEschatological Midrash^a)
 I 4 104n128
 II 18 – III 13 83n21
 II 19 82
 II 19 – III 13 82
 III 82
 III 1–13 82n13, 83
 III 2 82n15, 83, 278n17
 III 3 9n38, 83, 84n25,
 160n86
 III 4 83, 84
 III 5 85
 III 5–6 84
 III 6 83, 85, 125n249
 III 7 86, 86n39
 III 7–9 83, 87
 III 8–9 82
 III 10–11 83
 III 10–13 81
 III 11 82, 87
 III 12 82n15, 87, 278n17
 III 13 83
 III 14 83
 III 15 82n15, 278n17
 III 17 82
 III 18 83n19, 87
 III 19 82n15, 83n19
 13 + 14 V 3 82n15, 278n17
 21 83n21
- 4Q177 (4QEschatological Midrash^b)
 II + 10 + 26 + 9 + 20 + 27 II 10 82n15
 2 + 24 + 14 + 3 + 4 + 1 + 31 III 2 82n15
 2 + 24 + 14 + 3 + 4 + 1 + 31 III 5 82n15
 2 + 24 + 14 + 3 + 4 + 1 + 31 III 7 82n15
 12 + 13I + 15 IV 7 82n15
 13II V 6 82n15
- 4Q179 (4Q Apocryphal Lamentations A)
 I 206n40
- 4Q181 (4Q Ages of Creation B)
 I II 4 131n284
- 4Q201 (4QEnoch^a ar)
 I 5 147n13
 I 6 147n16
 IV 6–7 148n21
 IV 7 148
- 4Q202 (4QEnoch^b ar)
 I II 7 148n21
 III 7 148
- 4Q204 (4QEnoch^c ar)
 VI 4 152n39, 190n235
 VI 21 151n36
 4 10 158n76
- 4Q213 (4Q Levi^a ar)
 3 180n186
 3 + 4 6 178n180
- 4Q213a (4Q Levi^b ar)
 I II 6–18 152n39
 I II 16 184n207
 I II 18 190n235, 190n237
- 4Q213b (4Q Levi^c ar)
 6 308n152
- 4Q216 (4Q Jubilees^a)
 II 9 173n153
 IV 6–7 171n143
 IV 7 173n153
 IV 10 173n153
 VII 16 101n109
- 4Q223–224 (4QpapJubilees^b)
 2 I 53 120n220
 2 II 13 120n220
- 4Q225 (4QpsJub^a)
 1 7 92n63
 2 5 120n220
- 4Q256 (4QCommunity Rule^b)
 5 5–6 (IX 5–6) 99
 XVIII 2 120n220

4Q257 (4QCommunity Rule^c)

III 5	120n220
III 13	120n220

4Q258 (4QCommunity Rule^d)

I I 4–5	99
3 I 5	101–102n115
VI 5	120n220
VII 1	120n220
VII 3	120n220
VII 6	120n220
VII 7	120n220
VII 8	120n220
VII 9	120n220
VIII 3	120n220

4Q259 (4QCommunity Rule^e)

I III 1	100n109
II 10	120n220
II 18	120n220
III 1	120n220
III 18	120n220

4Q265 (4QMiscellaneous Rules)

7 II 14	86
---------	----

CD (Damascus Document)

I 21	120n220
II 5	99n101
II 15	120n220
II 15–16	135n308
III 20	37n44
III 23	304n136
IV 6–7	99n101
IV 9–10	99n101
IV 15–18	79n3
V 1–5	89n48
V 6–7	79n3, 146n8
VII 5	120n218, 120n220
XI 21–XII 2	175n166
XII 1–2	79n3
XIV 6–7	120n222
XIV 6–10	121n222
XV 15–17	104n128
XX 2	120n220
XX 5	120n220
XX 7	120n220
XX 34	99n101

4Q266 (4QDamascus Document^a)

2 I 4	120n220
2 I 24	120n220
2 II 16	120n220
3 III 6	120n220
5 I 19	120n220
5 II 7	39n48
8 I 1–7	104n128
11 I	120n222
11 8	120n222

4Q267 (4QDamascus Document^b)

9 V 10–11	120n222
-----------	---------

4Q268 (4QDamascus Document^c)

1 6	120n220
-----	---------

4Q270 (4QDamascus Document^e)

7 I 16	120n222
--------	---------

4Q280 (4QCurses) 117n200

4Q286 (4QBerakhot^a)

1 II 6	138n323
1–7 1	117
2 a, b, c	117
2 a, b, c 1	118
2 a, b, c 2	118
2 a, b, c 3	117n205
2 a, b, c 4	117–18, 117n205, 118n208
2 a, b, c 5	118
7 1	118n208
7 a I 2	118–19
7 a I 3	118–19
7 a I 6	118–19, 135n306
12	117, 119n215

4Q287 (4QBerakhot^b)

1–5	117
2	119
2:1	142n350
2 1–7a	119
2 2	138n323, 138n326
2 5	119n215
2 7	119n215
2 7b–8	119
2 9–13	119
2 10	119–20

4Q287 (4QBerakhot^b) (cont.)

2 12	119
2 13	119
3	119
3 1	119, 119n215
3 2-4	119
5 1	118n208
7 11	116n200

4Q289 (4QBerakhot^d)

1	120
1 4	120
1 5	120
1 6	120
3 2	120n221

4Q317 (4Q cryptA Phases of the Moon)

121n225

4Q369 (4QPrayer of Enosh)

1 11 5-7 109

4Q374 (4QDiscourse on the Exodus/Conquest Traditions)

2 11 6 158n75

4Q374 (4Q Exodus/Conquest Traditions)

9 3 312n7

4Q377 (4QApocryphon Pentateuch B)

1 recto 11 1-12	158n75
1 recto 11 5	312n7
2 ii 4-12	295n100

4Q392 (4QWorks of God)

1 9 118n210

4Q394 (4QMMT^a)

3-7 11 16-19	364n256
8 IV 10-11	364n256

4Q396 (4QMMT^c)

111 1-2 364n256

4Q397 (4QMMT^d)

3 3	364n256
6-13 3-5	364n256

4Q400 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^a)

1 1 1	102n118, 131n281
1 1 2	131, 131n281
1 1 3	131
1 1 4	131, 131n282
1 1 4-5	131
1 1 6	31n11
1 1 16	131, 140
1 1 17	131
1 1 20	131
2	102n118
2 1	133
2 5-7	133
2 6	132n285
2 6-8	132, 133n294
2 7	367n266
2 8	133, 133n293
3 11 + 5 8	102n117

4Q401 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^b)

1-2 1	102n117
16 2	52n126

4Q402 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^c)

1 1 30	102n117
1 11 18	102n117
2 3-4	136
9 3	52n126

4Q403 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^d)

1 1 1	134
1 1 14	134n304
1 1 18	134n304
1 1 21	134
1 1 22	120n218, 120n220
1 1 23	134
1 1 26	134n304
1 1 30-31	128
1 1 44	138n323
1 11 3	138n323
1 11 10	135
1 11 15	76n248
1 11 16	138n323
1 11 21	134n300

4Q404 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^e)

2 3	120n218, 120n220
6 5	138n323

4Q405 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^f)

8-9 1	102n117
8-9 4-5	134n300
13 6	120n218, 120n220
14-15 I 4	137
15 II-16 3	136-37, 39n109
15 II-16 4	137
15 II-16 5	137, 39n109
15 II-16 6	39n48
18 3	52n126
18 5	52n126
20 II 21-22 2	139n331
20 II 21-22 3	76n248
20 II 21-22 2-5	139, 378n37
20 II 21-22 6	102n117
20 II 21-22 7	135n311
20 II 21-22 8	138, 138n323, 140, 139n331, 378n37
20 II 21-22 9	76n248
22 7	52n126
22 8	52n126
22 12	52n126
22 13	52n126
23 I 3	140, 139n331
23 II 7	151n38
23 II 12-13	140
94 1-2	140, 140n341
94 2	140

4Q406 (4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^g)

1 2	127n263
1 4	102n117
3.2	127n263

4Q415 (4QInstruction^a)

2 I + 1 II 3	120n220
--------------	---------

4Q417 (4QInstruction^c)

2 I 17	138n323
--------	---------

4Q418 (4QInstruction^d)

43-45 I 9	120n220
43-45 I 13	138n323
69 15	109n163
81	110n166
81 1-2	109
81 3	109
81 4	109
81 4-5	109

81 5	109
172 4	120n220

4Q423 (4QInstruction^g)

8 + 23 1-4	109n161
------------	---------

4Q445 (4Q Lament A)

4 3	120n220
-----	---------

4Q448

1 9	120n220
-----	---------

4Q491 (4QWar Scroll^a)

1-3	105n138
8-10 I 5	120n220

4Q491c (4QSelf

Glorification Hymn^b) 111n168, 285n52, 378n37

1 4-6	139n328
1 11	151n38

4Q503 (4Q Daily Prayers^a)

1-6 III 8	121n225
4 7-11	122
7-9 IV 3-4	123
11 3	122n231
13-16	123
13-16 11	123
VII	121n225, 121n226, 121n225

4Q510 (4QSongs of the Sage^a)

1 2	131n284
1 4	124n238
1 9	120n220

4Q511 (4QSongs of the Sage^b)

2 I 1	124n238
2 I 6	124n240, 125, 131n284
2 I 7-10	124
2 I 8	124n240
2 I 9-10	124
2 I 10	124n240
2 II 6	124n240
8 4	124n238
8 6-11	124
10 8	120n220
18 II 8	124n240
18 II 10	124n240
19 4	124n240

4Q511 (4QSongs of the Sage^b) (cont.)

30 4-6	133
30 6	124n240
35	133
35 1-2a	124
35 1-5	124
35 1-8	85n27
35 2	124n240, 124n24
35 2-3	124
35 3	124n240, 125
35 4	125, 136
35 5	124
63 III 3	120n220
73 2	124n240

4Q525 (4QBeatitudes)

5 11	120n220
------	---------

4Q528 (4QHymnic or Sapiential Work B)

1 4	120n220
11-12 3	120n220

4Q541 (4Q Apocryphon of Levi^b (?) ar)

9 I 2	189n229
-------	---------

4Q543 (4Q Visions of Amram^a ar)

3 1	312n7
-----	-------

4Q545 (4Q Visions of Amram^c ar)

1 I 17	312n7
--------	-------

4Q554 (4QNew Jerusalem^a ar)

1	96n86
1 I 9-22	96, 160n89, 248n273
2 III (?) 14-22	96n91

11Q5 (11Q Psalms^a)

XVIII 1	120n220
XVIII 18	120n220
XXII 8	120n220
XXVII 3	120n220

11Q13 (11QMelchizedek)

II 9	131n284
II 10-11	277n13

11Q17 (11QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice)

II 1	102n117
IV 6	139n333

v 8 139, 378n37

VII 2 139n331

VII 9 102n117

VII 10 52n126

VII 11 52n126

VII 14 52n126

VIII 3 138n323

IX 3-5 140

IX 4 140

IX 4-5 189n229

IX 6 138n323

X 7 139n331

11Q18 (11QNew Jerusalem ar)

21-29 97

11Q19 (11QTemple)

XVII 9 90n54

XXIX 91, 91n59, 92n66

XXIX 3 90n54

XXIX 7-8 92

XXIX 7-9 181n196, 404n165

XXIX 7-10 91, 160n86

XXIX 8 92

XXIX 8-9 90n54, 92

XXIX 8-10 9n38

XXIX 9 92, 92n64

XXIX 9-10 96

XXIX 10 249n279

XXX 4 90n54

XXX 5 90n54

XXX 7 90n54

XXX 8 90n54

XXXI 6 90n54

XXXI 7 90n54

XXXII 12 90n54

XXXV 1 90n54

XXXV 8 90n54

XXXV 9 90n54

XXXV 10 90n54

XLV 11-12 175n166

LI 14 90n54

LX 10-11 185n210

LX 21 120n220

LX-LXV 95n83, 160n89,

248n273

XQpapEnoch

148

Philo of Alexandria*De Abrahamo*

18 354n204
 81 354n204
 119–120 429n266

De aeternitate mundi

15 59n163
 41–44 340n134
 113 354n204

De agricultura

151 289n69

De cherubim

57 346n156
 73 346n156
 87–90 334n107
 126 340n134
 127–128 340n134

De confusion linguarum

62–63 289n69
 64 408n183
 102 427n254
 146 289n69

De congress eruditionis gratia

8 59n163
 101 400n150
 105 340n134
 116–117 69n207
 159 400n150

De vita contemplativa

4–5 340n134

Quod deterius potiori insidari solet

10 400n150
 83 59n163
 87 430n266
 160 59n163, 363n250

Quod Deus sit immutabilis

21 340n134
 25 340n134
 30 340n134

31

132

177

340n134

374n20, 382n63

429n266

De ebrietate

9 382n63
 17 342n139
 85 374n20
 95–100 363n250
 134 70, 331n92

In Flaccum

41 430n266
 46 65, 65n193, 342n139
 48 66n195
 165 429n266

De fuga et inventione

12 429n266
 17 400n150
 82 400n150
 131 400n150
 208 289n69

De gigantibus

23 340n134
 33 400n150
 54 363n250
 66 354n204

Quis rerum divinarum heres sit

82 342n139, 374n20
 84 374n20
 112 59n163
 162 400n150
 181 427n254
 187 429n266
 221 69n208
 221–229 69, 210n73, 331n92,
 391n111
 225 59n163
 250 346n156
 256 408n183
 274 342n139

De Iosepho

136 354n204

Legum Allegoriae

1.5	319n33
1.6	319n33
1.16	319n33, 329n80
1.18	319n33
1.32	400n150
1.35	400n150
1.43	59n163
1.45	59n163
3.46	363n250
3.52	400n150
3.96	6n19, 429n266
3.96–103	429n266
3.98	340n134
3.99	340n134
3.102	59n163, 406n171
3.102–103	67, 312n7
3.103	312n7
3.135	399n147
3.169	319n33

Legatio ad Gaium

6	346n156
186–329	65
186–188	65
191	66, 66n196
192–196	66
207–253	66
263–270	66
277	342n139
278	66
278–80	66
279–89	66
285	342n139
290–320	66
319	374n20
320	429n266
321–329	66
366	400n150

De migratione Abrahami.

12	59n163
40	429n266

De vita Mosis

1.155–158	233n194
1.289	400n150
2.25–41	46n89

2.26–44	68n200
2.51	429n266
2.70	312n7
2.70–108	68, 210n73
2.73–82	331n92
2.74	6n19, 59n163, 408n179
2.76	68
2.77–83	69
2.77–108	69
2.79	69
2.80	69
2.84–88	69, 256n309
2.88–127	236n211
2.94	399n147
2.101	374n20
2.102–103	69, 331n92
2.105	69
2.117	59n163
2.117–125	58n159
2.117–130	256n309
2.136–40	68, 210n73
2.143	59n163
2.149	399n147
2.152	374n20
2.231	66n195
2.267	429n266
2.276	399n147

De mutatione nominum

29–32	340n134
60	354n204
126	346n156
130	354n204

De opificio mundi

16	59n163
25	59n163
139	59n163
141	59n163
146	429n266

De plantatione

27	429n266
50	59n163, 429n266
59	297n107
126	189n233
133	427n254
146	342n139

De posteritate Caini

20	346n156
31	304n133
63	289n69
64	319n33, 329n80
89	297n107
105	59n163
112–119	429n266
122	408n183
183	319n33
184	399n147

1.214	377n32
1.215	59n163, 70n212, 289n69
1.219	377n32
2.3	408n183
2.115–116	430n266
2.183	377n32
2.186	399n147
2.188–189	312n7
2.193	400n150
2.231	399n147
2.250	348n171

De praemiis et poenis

17	354n204
41	400n150
104	400n150

Quod omnis probus liber sit

62	430n266
----	---------

De providentia

2.15–16	340n134
2.64	65

De sobrietate

132–134	429n266
---------	---------

Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum

2.52	406n171
2.68–69	69, 210n73, 331n92,
	391n111
2.73	69n208
2.73–81	69n208
2.76–81	69n208
2.82	406n171
2.83	70, 331n92
2.85	69n207

Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin

1.76	319n33
------	--------

De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini 126

126	289n69
-----	--------

De somniis

1.114	346n156
1.150	251n287
1.153–156	251n287
1.206	6n19, 59n163, 429n266

De specialibus legibus

1.66	67, 69n210, 391n111
1.67	67
1.67–69	67
1.67–78	66
1.71	67
1.72	67, 374n20
1.73	67
1.78	67
1.84–85	58n159
1.93–96	58n159
1.152	399n147
1.172	70, 210n73
1.249	399n147
1.276	374n20
1.332	400n150
2.237	429n266
3.231	346n156
4.17	341n137
4.146	429n266
4.191	399n147

De virtutibus

74	399n147
78	400n150

Josephus

Life

13–16	254
80	271n9
363	262
422–425	254
430	254

Against Apion

1.1–2	264
1.47–56	264n339

Against Apion (cont.)

1.188	52n125
1.195–199	50n116
1.198	50n112
2.1–2	77n253
2.76–77	265n345
2.77	14n68
2.102–111	264
2.105	77n253
2.193	265
2.193–198	14n68
2.194–195	265

Jewish Antiquities

1.5	255n304
1.10	255n304
1.24–25	257n310
1.118–119	61n170
1.180	242n243, 365n259
1.224–226	228n170
1.317	342n139
2.224–257	255
3.100	255
3.100–290	255
3.102–187	14n68
3.122–125	255
3.123	6n19, 256, 33n92, 39n111
3.125	255, 374n20
3.153	53n130
3.179–187	256
3.180	257
3.181	33n92, 39n111
3.201	257
3.212	255n306
3.216–218	54n135
3.218	240n230
3.223	255n306
3.224–257	14n68
4.199–201	257, 265n344
4.313	257
4.314	265n347
7.67	242n243
7.91	257
7.333	228n170
8	258
8.71	258
8.79	258
8.95	258

8.99	258
8.102	258n318, 258n319
8.105	374n20
8.106	258
8.106–121	258
8.107	258
8.108	259
8.114	258
8.115	374n20
9.183	263n330
10.136	259
10.143	259
10.144	259
10.145	259
10.154	259
11	260, 263n330
11.80–81	19n90
11.81	51n119
11.82	260
11.89	260
11.97	260
11.299–300	262n328
12.11–118	44n77, 46n89
12.23	340n134
12.30	395n130
12.35	340n134
12.155	395n130
12.304	342n139
13.292	196n267
14	263n330
15	255n303
15.136	295n100
15.380–425	260
15.418–420	260
16.290	395n130
17.93	395n130
17.136	40n50
17.149–167	192n247
17.182	395n130
17.188–199	192n247
17.303	395n130
17.314	395n130
18.74	374n20
18.257–260	256n307
19.332	383n64
20	263n330
20.11	342n139
20.164–166	262
20.181	271n9

20.206–207	271n9
20.216–218	30n3
20.259	254
20:267	254
<i>Jewish War</i>	
1.2	262
1.3	261
1.9–12	262
1.26	77n253
1.152	374n20
1.374	407n176
1.434	342n139
1.502	395n130
1.507	407n176
2	262
2.208	407n176
2.316–342	263n330
2.390	264
2.397	407n176
2.411	374n20
2.414	263n330
2.539	263
3–6	262
3.354	264
3.484	264
4.84–223	263n334
4.104	263
4.278	374n20
4.288–299	263
4.297	263
4.298–299	264
4.323	264
4.324–325	257n310
5	255n303
5.100	374n20
5.184–236	260
5.207	259n321, 260, 423n231
5.211	374n20
5.212	6n19
5.213–214	261
5.227	264n343
5.227–237	77n253
5.231–235	261
5.237	261
5.367–419	264
5.380	261n324
5.565	374n20
6	255n303

6.38–39	264
6.94–97	263n329
6.100–102	263n329
6.103	407n176
6.106	407n176
6.110–111	264
6.111	262
6.241	263
6.243	263
6.248	374n20
6.252	263
6.260	374n20
6.260–266	263
6.299	374n20
6.438	242n243
7	262

Ancient Near Eastern Texts

Atrahasis Epic

I i 1–49	331n93
----------	--------

Code of Hammurabi 6n19

Enuma Elish

I 35–40	331n93
I 71–75	331n93
I 71–78	330n90
I 108–110	331n93
IV 141–146	330n90
V 122–128	331n93
VI 45–81	330n90
VII 9–14	331n93

Gudea of Lagash 6n19

Cylinder B: I 1–7 330n90

Theology of Memphis 331n93

Rabbinic Texts

Mishnah

m. Abot 1.11	163n107
m. Kelim 1.6–9	77n253
m. Middot 1.1	265n347
m. Qiddushin 1.8	14n68
m. Tamid 1.2–4	52n126
m. Tamid 3.2	52n126
m. Tamid 3.8	52n126

Mishnah (cont.)

m. Tamid 4.1	72n224
m. Tamid 5.1–2	52n126
m. Tamid 6.3–7.3	39n48
m. Yoma 1.1	392n115
m. Yoma 7.3	39n48

Tosefta

t. Hag. 2.1	205n32
t. San. 7.11	330n87
t. San. 13.10	323n57
t. Sotah 13.2	240n230

Babylonian Talmud

b. Ber. 11b	123n236
b. Ber. 32b	224n148
b. Hag. 12b	77n249, 106n145, 141n347, 189n233, 204n25, 348n171
b. Hag. 14b–15b	205n32
b. Hullin 91b	251n285
b. Ned. 39b	205n32
b. Pesah 54a	205n32
b. San. 38b	378n39
b. San. 103b	217n107
b. San. 110b	323n57
b. Yoma 21b	240n230

Jerusalem Talmud

y. Hag. 77b	205n32
y. Megillah 1.11	38n45
y. Sheqalim 8.2	137n318

Targums

Fragmentary Targum

Gen 28:12	251n285, 285n52
Gen 48:22	38n45

Targum 1 Samuel

2:35	314n13
------	--------

Targum 1 Chronicles

17:14	314n13
-------	--------

Targum Isaiah

53:5	249n279
------	---------

Targum Ezekiel

1:16	229n178
------	---------

Targum Jonathan

Isaiah 66:1	217n107
-------------	---------

Targum Neofiti

Gen 9:16	151n38
Gen 14:18	365n259
Gen 22:2	228n170
Gen 28:12	251n285, 285n52
Gen 49:27	182n197

Targum Onqelos

Gen 2:28	205n32
Gen 9:16	151n38
Gen 49:27	182n197
Deut 33:2	295n100
Num 12:7	314n15

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

Gen 2:28	205n32
Gen 3:24	205n32
Gen 9:16	151n38
Gen 27:15	38n45
Gen 28:12	251n285, 285n52
Gen 49:27	182n197
Exod 15:17	235n204
Exod 35:27	239n225
Deut 33:2	295n100
Num 12:7	314n15

Targum Zechariah

6:12	249n279
------	---------

Midrash and Other Literature

'Aggadat Berešit	38n45
------------------	-------

Baba Batra

75b	348n171
-----	---------

Baraytha b. Yom

72b	137n318
-----	---------

Bereshit Rabbati

P. 32	236n211
-------	---------

Genesis Rabbah

17:4	175n165
18:6	175n166
19:3	175n166
20:12	38n45
38:13	226n158
44:21	210n69
65:21	140n338, 277n13
66:12	251n285
69:7	94n78
78:3	251n285
97:6	38n45

Exodus Rabbah

33:3	235n204
32:7	252n292
43:9	234n196
52:2	257n312

Leviticus Rabbah

29:2	252n292
29:3–9	378n39
32:2	323n57

Numbers Rabbah

4:1	251n285
4:8	38n45
12:12	136n313
12:13	236n211
14:9	323n57

Psalms Rabbah

95:11	323n57
-------	--------

Qoheleth Rabbah

10:20	323n57
-------	--------

Song of Songs Rabbah

1:12	295n100
1:44	183n32

Midrash Tanḥuma Exodus

Parashah 11 Parts I–IV	233n194
------------------------	---------

Psalms Midrash

Psalms 68	295n100
Psalms 72:66	205n32
Psalms 90	9n37
Psalms 90:13	205n32

Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael

Shirata 10	9n37, 235n204
------------	---------------

Pirke Rabbi El.

45B	205n32, 251n285
-----	-----------------

Sifre Deuteronomy 257

236n206

Tanḥumah

b. Toledoth 6.12	38n45
------------------	-------

Early Christian Writings

Ambrose

De sacramentis

4.6	188n228
27	188n228

Athenagoras

Legatio pro Christianis

13	188n228
----	---------

Barnabas

11:9	208n54
16:3–4	265n347

1 Clement

36	13, 14n65
40–41	14n68
41:2	185n210
60:1	290
65:2	189n232

Chrysostom

Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos

III	291n81
VII	374n20
XIV, 3	410n193
XVI	422n229
XXXV	420n224

Epiphanius

Panarion

39.9.2	422n229
--------	---------

Eusebius

Historia ecclesiastica

6:14	12n56
6.25	12 n 56

Praeparatio evangelica

8.2-5	44n77
8.9	44n77
9.38	44n77

Demonstratio evangelica

1	188n228
6	188n228
29	188n228
50	188n228

Gregory of Nyssa

Contra eunomium

2:8	291n84
4:3	291n84

Ignatius of Antioch

To the Philadelphians

360n237

Ireneaus

Against Heresies

4.14.3	406n171
--------	---------

Justin

Dialogue with Trypho

115	397n135
117	189n233

Martyrdom of Polycarp

21	189n232
----	---------

Melito of Sardis

Homily on the Passion

36-37	426n250
-------	---------

Origen

Contra Celsum

8:21	188n228
------	---------

De principiis

2.3.6	220n119, 221n129
-------	------------------

Ecclesiastical History

6.14	12n57
6.25	12n56

Tatian

Oratio ad Graecos (Pros Hellēnas)

23	422n229
----	---------

Theodoret of Cyrus

Interpretation of Hebrews

1	291n81
---	--------

New Testament Apocrypha and
Pseudepigrapha

Apostolic Constitutions and Canons

2.25.7	188n228
6.23.5	188n228
8.5.2	340n134
8.5.7	188n228
8.12.2	340n134
8.40.2	340n134

Greco-Roman Literature

Aeschylus

Prometheus Bound

373n18

Aristotle

Politics

7.3-4	51
7.11	50, 50n115
7.17-33	52n128

Diodorus Siculus

Library of History

v. 44.2	52n127
---------	--------

Eupolemus

Fragments

34:5	407n176
34.6	62n177

Herodotus

Histories

3.25.4 373n18

Homer

Iliad

20.13 374n20

Plato

Cratylus

411D	423n231
------	---------

Laws

745B	50n112
------	--------

Parmenides

130B	423n231
143A	423n231
150B	423n231

Phaedo

99B	346n156
99E	346n156

Protagoras

360E	423n231
------	---------

Respublica

438C	423n231
582A	423n231
612C	423n231

Sophista

256B	423n231
------	---------

Timaeus

28A–29B	67n199
28B	346n156
31B	346n156

Pindar

<i>Isthmian Odes</i> 4.5	373n18
--------------------------	--------

Plutarch

<i>Lives</i> 17:2	418n216
<i>Superstition</i> 166	334n107

Sophocles

<i>Fragments</i> 432.8	38n48
<i>Philoctetes</i> 743	373n18